DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 320 CG 003 896

Secondary Student Status Survey 1967-1968. Part I.
Hawaii State Dept. of Education, Honolulu.
Report No-HSDE-OR-RR-65
Pub Date 31 Aug 68
Note-146p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.40
Descriptors-Curriculum Problems, *Dropout Prevention, Dropout Rehabilitation, *Dropouts, Educational Change, Environmental Influences, *Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Needs, Individualized Curriculum, Individual Needs, Research, *Secondary School Students, *Surveys

The study, which compares a group of high school dropouts to a group of lowest quintile graduates, shows similarity in most areas of comparison regarding academic ability, character traits and family background. Findings show that the decision to drop out is based on a complex network of reasons with the problem of poor attendance most often cited as the major cause. While the dropouts were counseled by school personnel and other professionals, only a small number benefited from an individual curriculum adjustment which the author feels is the most valuable preventive measure available for combating early school termination. A comparison of the two groups may be interpreted as follows: (1) higher attendance may have some effect on eventual graduation, (2) failing contributes decisively to the decision to drop out, (3) "satisfactory" academic performance more consistently characterizes the lowest quintile graduates, and (4) character trait ratings for the graduates most often increase over the period of school years while those for the dropout do not. The author suggests that prevention of dropouts rests heavily on: (1) coping with character trait problems, (2) curriculum adjustment to individual needs, (3) educational objectives which are both challenging and attainable, and (4) evaluation techniques in terms of individual ability and effort. (J.S.)

ED029320

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SECONDARY STUDENT STATUS SURVEY
1967-68

PART I

Research Report No. 65

Office of Research

State of Hawaii
Department of Education
August 31, 1968

CG 003896

MATERIALS COURTESY OF
Guidance Program - General Education Branch
Office of Instructional Services
Department of Education P. O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

STATE OF HAWAII BOARD OF EDUCATION
1966-1970

Dr. Richard E. Ando (Chairman), Honolulu
Mr. Ronald Harker (Vice Chairman), Kauai
Mr. George S. Adachi, Leeward Oahu
Mr. John B. Connell, Windward Oahu
Mr. Eugene Harrison, Central Oahu
Mrs. Myrtle K. Kaapu, Oahu-At-Large
Mr. Robert C. Loveless, Oahu-At-Large
Mr. Phillip Mayer, Oahu-At-Large
Mrs. Ruth Tabrah, Hawaii
Mr. Kiyoto Tsubaki, Maui
Mr. Hiroshi Yamashita, Hawaii

Mr. Ralph H. Kiyosaki
Superintendent of Education

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Dr. William G. Savard, Assistant Superintendent
Mr. Ronald L. Johnson, Staff Specialist, Research
Mr. Charles T. Araki, Education Statistician
Miss Beatrice L.Q. Loui, Staff Specialist, Testing
Mr. Richard B. Arakaki, Research Statistician

SECONDARY STUDENT STATUS SURVEY
1967-68

PART I

Research Report No. 65

State of Hawaii
Department of Education
August 31, 1968

PREFACE

The study of 1966-67 public high school dropouts was separately published as Part I of the Secondary Student Status Survey, 1967-68, to provide for an early distribution of data on the dropouts. Additional data compiled for the dropout study were extensive enough this year to warrant a separate preliminary report of selected data from the annual publication of the Secondary Student Status Survey. Part II, which will follow shortly, will include all the other regular sections: plans of seniors, follow-up of graduates, courses pursued by secondary students, and other general information on enrollment, promotion-retention, and holding power.

This preliminary report on dropouts includes some basic and supportive data drawn from the other sections of Part II. It was the original intent, since the first publication (interim report) of the Secondary Student Status Survey for the school year 1965-66, to fuse the data of all sections of the report for the purpose of providing as clear and as comprehensive a picture of secondary students as possible. Parts I and II for the 1968 report show extensive fusion of the data of all sections of the Secondary Student Status Survey. Each section shows dependence upon other sections while simultaneously serving as a source of basic statistical data for all other sections of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Purpose 3

Procedures 5

Limitations 11

Findings on Group Characteristics of Dropouts 11

The Curriculum and the Dropout 40

  Courses Pursued by the 1966-67 Dropouts 48
  Research Studies on Curriculum Needs of Potential Dropouts . . 40

Follow-up of Dropouts 55

  Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps Enrollees 55
  Social Welfare Recipients 59

Study of Sample Graduates Selected for Comparison with Dropouts . . 61

  Comparison of Sample Graduates and Dropouts 61
  The Curriculum and the Graduate 74
    Courses Pursued by the 1967 Graduates 76
    Comparison of Courses Pursued by Graduates and Dropouts 75
  Employment After Graduation 84

Summary 85

  Statistical Summary of Comparison Between Graduates and Dropouts 90
  Comparison of 1965-66 and 1966-67 Dropouts 91
  Summary Profile of Hawaii Public School Dropouts 96

Appendix 99

  A. A Proposed Set of Procedures for the Early Identification of Potential High School Dropouts 99
  B. Special Project to Identify and Report Potential High School Dropouts 125
  C. Detailed Data (by School Areas) on Sample Graduates . . 131
  D. Special Programs for Meeting the Problems of Potential Dropouts in the Five Participating High Schools 143
  E. Selected Studies Reporting Special Programs to Prevent School Withdrawal. 147

LIST OF TABLES

No. Page

I-A Comparative Data between Total Dropout Population (Gr. 9-12, 1966-67) and Selected Sample 8

II-A Types of Reasons for Dropping Out--by Status in September 1967--of Dropout Sample (Gr. 9-12, 1966-67) 13

III-A Major Efforts Taken by School--by Status in September--of Dropout Sample Gr. 9-12, 1966-67). 14

IV-A General Characteristics of Sample Dropouts (Gr. 9-12, 1966-67) Who Are Still Out of School 16

V-A School Status at Time of Exit Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School 17

VI-A Elementary School Standardized Test Scores for Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School 23

VII-A School History, Elementary to Secondary of Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School 29

VIII-A Family Background, by Geographical Areas 34

IX-A Courses Pursued (One-Half to Full Completion of Courses) by Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School by Number and Grade Level 48

X-A Comparison between Sample Dropouts and State Total: Distribution of Enrollment in Various Subject Areas 54

XI-A Participation of 1966-67 Dropouts in Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps 56

XII-A Sample Dropouts Who Are Public Welfare Recipients 60

XIII-A Comparison of General Characteristics between Sample Graduates and Dropouts 65

XIV-A Comparison of School History of Sample Graduates and Dropouts 66

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

No. Page

XV-A Comparison between Graduates and Dropouts on Elementary School Standardized Test Scores. 70

XVI-A Comparison between Sample Graduates and Dropouts on Family Background 72

XVII-A Courses Pursued by 184 Sample Graduates "Fully Employed" Within One Year After Graduation, by Grade Level (when courses were pursued) and Number 76

XVIII-A Comparison between Sample Graduates and State Total Distribution of Enrollment in Various Subject Areas 82

XIX-A Comparsion between Sample Graduates and Dropouts: Distribution of Enrollment in Various Subject Areas 83

XX-A Type of Work Reported for Graduates "Fully Employed" Within One Year After Graduation 84

XXI-A Statistical Summary of Comparison Between Graduates and Dropouts. 90

XXII-A Summary of Comparison between 1965-66 and 1966-67 Dropouts 91

XXIII-A Summary Profile of Hawaii Public High School Dropouts. 96

XXIV-A General Characteristics of Sample Graduates 133

XXV-A School History of Sample Graduates 134

XXVI-A Elementary School Standardized Test Scores for Graduates, by School Area 138

XXVII-A Family Background of Sample Graduates 141

INTRODUCTION

Hawaii's dropout problem has come into sharper focus recently in newspaper headlines. Concern for school dropouts is not new. Since 1872, this persistent problem has been "researched" and "headlined" by individuals and groups, large and small, ranging from the "little red schoolhouse" to the White House.

In his Educational Message to Congress, January 12, 1965, President Johnson summed up the nation's concern for the dropout as follows:

> "Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take. We want this not only for his sake -- but for the Nation's sake. Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness -- for armed might is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy -- for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government -- for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

Up until 1967, a yearly average of about 2.7 per cent of Hawaii school secondary students (grades 9-12) has been reported as dropouts. The 1966-67 dropout rate is reported as 2.3 per cent by the Guidance Branch.

Continuing concern for Hawaii's dropouts has led to the development of some significant programs on both school and state levels. Farrington High School and McKinley High School, for example, are concentrating on specific guidelines and special programs to curb their dropout problem. The Office of Research (Hawaii Department of Education) started a descriptive study a year ago compiling statistical data on dropouts' characteristics representative of the local setting.

Additional progress in this area can be expected of the most recent venture combining the efforts of Federal and State agencies. This new project was initiated in the form of an interim potential school dropout reporting system to identify and follow-up dropouts and potential dropouts as quickly as possible. Computer Center No. 3, the DOE Office of Research and Special Services Branch, Employment Opportunity Center of the Department of Labor, and Federal Manpower Agencies are all involved in this initial project. An evaluation of the effectiveness of this project will be conducted in June, 1968. If successful, this type of project should greatly assist in the prevention and rehabilitation of dropouts. (For a more complete description of this project, refer to Appendix A.)

PURPOSE

As part of the annual Secondary Student Status Survey, a comprehensive study of Hawaii's public school dropouts (grades 9-12) was initiated last year. Data are again to be compiled to show distributions of various characteristics (reasons for dropping, school status, standardized test scores, school history, family background, etc.) of dropouts from which profiles may be established and some predisposing conditions identified. A repeated study of characteristics should show support or inconsistency of findings.

For further study on dropout characteristics, a comparison is made this year between dropouts and a special group of graduates. Numerous studies have been reported comparing characteristics of graduates and dropouts. Findings have been consistent in most areas of comparison regarding academic ability, character traits, and family background (educational level of parents, occupation and ethnic background of father, number of siblings, etc.). It is hypothesized here that a study of a special group of graduates (who, in many cases, barely managed to graduate and who were not enrolled in post-high school institutions but became fully employed within a year after graduation) whose characteristics appeared to resemble more closely those of dropouts than other graduates may reveal data on more significant differences between a graduating group and a dropout group. If the two groups were similar in most areas, what are the distinguishing factors that help graduates persist in school? A comparison of group characteristics of dropouts and graduates should assist in more positively identifying those elements, experiences, or family background which seem to be the predisposing factors in dropping out.

It is also the purpose of this second report to focus upon curriculum problems related to dropouts. Repeatedly, research findings show that "academic failure" and "disinterest in school" rank high as reasons for leaving school. To what extent does repeated failure (F's) or unsatisfactory work (D's) contribute to discouragement and eventual dropping out? What kinds and levels of courses are pursued by the dropouts prior to dropping out? A study of the courses pursued by both the special group of graduates and dropouts to be presented in this report should provide another relevant point of comparison. Statistics concerning the academic dilemma of dropouts should assist in evaluating current curriculum practices directly affecting potential dropouts.

A follow-up of dropouts, though on a limited scale, is another aspect of this second report. What happens to the dropout when schooling is abruptly terminated? How many actually return to school within the year? Are the dropouts able to find employment? Do dropouts seek the help of community agencies such as the Department of Labor, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Job Corps? How are the dropouts assisted by the community agencies? What is the extent of their participation in such agencies? These are some of the questions that need to be answered as further steps are taken to curb the dropout rate and to plan for school re-entry and employment opportunities.

It is the final purpose of this study on dropouts to propose a set of procedures for the identification, prediction, and follow-up of potential dropouts. Within a centralized school system, record keeping and reporting are operationally suited to mechanization by a computer. The proposal will be projected to benefit from maximum future use of computer data processing. Meanwhile, the proposal will be designed so that efforts can be expended immediately towards curbing the dropout rate.

PROCEDURES

CONDUCT

Descriptive Phase: This phase of the total dropout study was similar to that of the first study. The procedure was mainly that of gathering data on the detailed characteristics of the dropouts. Again, consideration was given to minimizing school personnel involvement (considering the numerous tasks that confront schools daily) for this phase of the study. The public high schools assisted in making school records available for data collecting: the dropout's cumulative records folder (Form 12 and 13), the student-appraisal folder (Form VE 82), and the pupil reporting form (Form 419).*

Follow-up Phase: The Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps agencies, the State Social Services Department, and the public high schools were all involved in the special follow-up of the dropouts. Files of the participants' job placements and work experiences were made available by the NYC and Job Corps agencies. The schools assisted in determining the status of the dropouts as of September 1967, whether the dropouts were still out of school or back in school. The Social Services Department identified the dropouts who were public welfare aid recipients and checked further on the status of the dropouts and their recent activities since leaving school.

Identification of Dropouts: The statewide dropout population for 1966-67, grades 9-12, was reported by the Guidance Branch as 1009. The dates of exit, limited to the duration of the school year 1966-67, determined the inclusion of the dropouts for the year's count. It must be remembered that any count of dropouts at any time of the year can be only temporary. Dropout figures can

---

*See following page.

Form 419
Rev. 1/64

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State of Hawaii

PUPIL REPORTING FORM

School (1-3)

To: Name of Parent or Legal Guardian
Date (4-9)

Address
Telephone

This is an official notification that

(Last) Name of Student (10-32) (First) (Middle)
Sex - F, M (33)
Birthdate (34-39)
Grade (40-41)

has Nature of Action (42) from school. (43-44)

(If suspension, no. of days .)

Reason for the action: (If several reasons are reported, please underline the **basic reason.**) (45-58)

These steps have been taken by the school to help the youngster to adjust: (59-70)

These are the next steps to be taken to help the youngster to adjust: (71-80)

In case of dismissal, action taken by District Superintendent

Signature
Date

Principal

Yellow copy to the District or Supervising Principal's Office; green copy to the Guidance Branch, State Office; and pink copy to be retained at the school.

change daily because of uncertainty in the status of the dropouts as they exit, re-enter, re-exit, etc., throughout the year. The term "dropout" is defined as follows:

> A dropout is a pupil who leaves school, for any reason except death, before graduation or completion of a program of studies and without transferring to another school.
>
> The term "dropout" is used to designate those grade 9-12 pupils who have been in membership during the regular school term and who withdraw from membership before completing their programs of studies. Such an individual is considered a dropout whether his dropping out occurs before or after he has passed the compulsory school attendance age, and where applicable, whether or not he has completed a minimum required amount of school work.

Sampling Procedures: The descriptive phase of the dropout study was based on a sampling of the 1966-67 dropouts. The sample of 286 was selected by the random sampling technique assuring a confidence level of 95 per cent. Comparisons (Table I-A) are provided at the onset of this study to assure that the sample selected is representative enough of the total dropout population. Preliminary data for the selected sample remain relatively similar to those of the total population.

Comparison of Dropouts and Graduates: The selection of a special group of public high school graduates for comparison was based upon data gathered initially for the Annual Follow-up Survey of High School Graduates. The 1967 sample graduates selected were those found to be employed rather than enrolled in school upon graduation and whose class standing fell in the lowest quintile group. School records necessary for the compilation of data on group characteristics were requested following the same procedures set up for the study of the group characteristics of dropouts.

Table I-A

Comparative Data between Total Dropout Population
(Gr. 9-12, 1966-67) and Selected Sample

	Total Reported Dropout Population*		Sample Selected		Sub-Sample**	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Total	1007	100.0	286	100.0	200	100.0
Male	695	69.0	189	66.1	128	64.0
Female	312	31.0	97	33.9	72	36.0
Grade 9	145	14.4	37	12.9	21	10.5
10	338	33.6	109	38.1	75	37.5
11	328	32.5	93	32.5	69	34.5
12	196	19.5	47	16.5	35	17.5
Honolulu	564	56.0	161	56.3	113	56.5
Rural	335	33.3	96	33.6	63	31.5
Neighbor Island	108	10.7	29	10.1	24	12.0

*Based on only those reported on Form 419 (not included are special education dropouts).

**Data on detailed characteristics of dropouts were compiled for the sub-sample group only. The original total sample (286) was reduced by 86 dropouts who had returned to school by the time of data compilation.

153
128
25

Curricular Courses Pursued: Grade slips and transcripts were checked to tally the types and numbers of courses pursued from grades 9-12. Utilized as basic references were the Department of Education publications, *Program of Studies for the Secondary Schools of Hawaii Grades 7-12* (1963) and the more recent *Authorized Courses and Code Numbers -- Secondary Education* (1967-68).

DATA

From the initial sample of 286 selected, 200 students were identified to be still out of school. Data for the descriptive phase of the study were mainly compiled for those still out of school. Again the types of data compiled were similar to those of the first report, which initially were based on a format developed by the National Education Association, *Dropout Studies -- Design and Conduct* (1965).

Types of Data	Source of Information (Primary = x, Secondary = ✓)		
	Form 419	Form 12, 13	Form VE82
1. Identification			
Sex	✓	x	
Religious preference		x	
Ethnic group		x	
2. Status at time of dropping out			
Date of exit	x		
Age of exit	x		
Grade at exit	x		
Attendance record		x	
3. School performance			
Standardized test scores		x	✓
Age-Grade placement:			
Years above or below		x	✓
Reading level		x	✓
General Scholastic achievement		x	✓
Per Cent of courses failed at last report		x	✓

Types of Data	Source of Information (Primary = x, Secondary =✓)		
	Form 419	Form 12, 13	Form VE82
4. Family background			
Highest grade completed by mother and father		x	✓
Occupation of father		x	✓
Pupil living with		x	✓
Number of siblings at residence		x	✓
Socioeconomics status		x	✓
Time in school district		x	✓
5. Reason for dropping out	x	✓	
6. Adjustment			
Disciplinary record	✓	x	
No. of different schools attended		x	
7. School efforts			
Steps taken to help pupil adjust	x	✓	

The collection of data on the characteristics of graduates covered most of the categories included in the study of the dropouts. Comparison of characteristics of the graduates and dropouts was limited to those categories of characteristics considered most critical according to findings of past studies on dropouts.

Data on the kinds, numbers, and grade levels of courses pursued by the sample dropouts and graduates were compiled to provide information on the scope and limitation of academic background and other educational experiences and on the distributive pattern of enrollment in the various subject areas.

The follow-up phase of the study was designed to pursue three sets of data: the identification of those dropouts (out of the total 1009) who participated in the out-of-school NYC and Job Corps programs and the types of training and work experiences and enrollment time in these programs; the percentage of sample dropouts who had returned to school by the beginning of the school year 1967-68; and the percentage of sample dropouts receiving public welfare assistance along with information on the status of these dropouts since leaving school.

LIMITATIONS

The statistical tables on the characteristics of dropouts show "no data" for various categories. Missing information is expected, to some degree, when cumulative records are relied upon. However, one area of concern was the incomplete enclosure of standardized test records for many of the students. There was a preponderance of missing or incomplete test records for transfer students. This situation was assumed to be due to incomplete transmittal of records and/or lack of evidence of testing.

Attendance records were also not consistently recorded for individuals. Records were either not kept up to date, not completely tallied, or not on standardized forms. Report cards, grade slips, and transcripts were incompletely recorded or filed for a number of individuals.

Other types of information needed for this study were frequently unavailable from school records. However limited because of reliance upon available records with inherent limitations, the extent of raw data was ample enough to provide reliable, substantiating information on the characteristics of the dropouts.

FINDINGS

Types of Reasons

The decision to drop out is invariably based on a complex network of reasons. To attribute a dropout's dilemma to a single cause or reason is grossly oversimplifying. Even a reason considered to be a "major" one may be, in actuality, far removed from what initially "triggered" the intricate process of early school withdrawal. Schools have the obligation, however, to seek out and identify the major problem areas of dropouts. Attempts should be made to pinpoint the major reasons involved.

Table II-A presents the types of reasons with a breakdown of the types as reported by the Guidance Branch. Consistent with last year, the attendance problem ranks first (56.0 per cent) in frequency of reason given. However, this year, poor attendance accounts for about half of the total number of times various reasons were cited. This is an increase of 20.5 per cent over last year's. It appears that "poor attendance" serves conveniently as a vague representation for the above mentioned maze of reasons too intricate to be justifiably divided into precise, absolute classifications.

Consistently again, a greater percentage of those with behavioral problems returned to school than those with other problems; also, more of those with economic problems remained out of school. This year's statistics show that two students dropped out because of smoking. It is interesting to note the present controversy over the problem of smoking in school--whether it should justify suspension and eventual expulsion or whether appropriate punishment should serve just as well in effectively deterring students from smoking has not yet been resolved satisfactorily.

School Efforts

Table III-A reports the major efforts taken by the school in dealing with dropouts. It was found that 72.5 per cent of the dropouts were primarily "counseled by school personnel." Another major effort is listed as "parent conference held" (65.5 per cent were involved in parent conferences). It is conspicuously noted that only 19 dropouts benefited primarily by "curriculum adjustment made." (This is more fully discussed in the section on curriculum.) It is felt that the most valuable preventive measure to combat the dropout problem lies in this area of curriculum adjustment. Effective "holding" of students will require measures of effort more precise than "counseled by school

Table II-A

Types of Reasons for Dropping Out--
by Status in September 1967--
of Dropout Sample (Gr. 9-12, 1966-67)

	Out of School				In School				Total			
	Total	No.	Per Cent Reasons (Vertical)	Per Cent Status (Horizontal)	Total	No.	Per Cent Reasons (Vertical)	Per Cent Status (Horizontal)	Total	No.	Per Cent Reasons (Vertical)	Per Cent Status (Horizontal)
Attendance	112		56.0	69.6	49		56.9	30.4	161		56.3	100.0
Non-attendance reason not known		85				42				7		
Truancy		23				5				28		
Cutting class		4				2				6		
Behavioral	22		11.0	59.5	15		17.5	40.5	37		12.9	100.0
Detrimental to discipline and moral of school		13				10		43.5		23		
Smoking		2				--				2		
Gambling		1				--				1		
Insubordination		1				--				1		
Fighting		1				1				2		
Involved in serious nature outside school		1				1				2		
Failure to conform		2				3				5		
Adjustment difficulty		1				--				1		
Academic	25		12.5	64.1	14		16.3	35.9	39		13.6	100.0
Disinterested, not profiting		21				9				30		
Failure in 1/2 or more classes		4				5				9		
Economic	22		11.0	84.6	4		4.6	15.4	26		9.1	100.0
Work		11				4				15		
Home situation (financial, needed at home)		7				--				7		
Armed services		4				--				4		
Marriage, Pregnancy	14		7.0	82.4	3		3.5	17.6	17		5.9	100.0
Marriage		5				1				6		
Pregnancy, out of wedlock		9				2				11		
Health, Physical	3		1.5	75.0	1		1.2	25.0	4		1.4	100.0
Illness		2				--				2		
Physical handicap		1				1				2		
Other	2		1.0	100.0	--		----	----	2		.8	100.0
Over-age		1				--				1		
Personal problems		1				--				1		
Total		200	100.0			86	100.0			286	100.0	

Table III-A

Major Efforts Taken by School--
by Status in September--
of Dropout Sample (Gr. 9-12, 1966-67)

Major Effort Taken*	Still Out of School No. of Pupils Helped	 Per Cent of Sample	In School No. of Pupils Helped	 Per Cent of Sample
Counseled by school personnel	145	72.5	74	86.0
Parent conference held	131	65.5	68	79.0
Previous disciplinary action invoked	26	13.0	11	12.8
Curriculum adjustments made	19	9.5	20	23.3
Case conference held with school personnel	3	1.5	3	3.5
Referred to DOE Special Services Branch	7	3.5	2	2.3
Counseled by community agency	32	16.0	18	21.0
Referred to outside agency	1	.5	2	2.3
District exception granted	3	1.5	--	----
Home instruction provided	3	1.5	1	1.3
Others	5	2.5	3	3.5
No Data	15	7.5	1	1.3

*Each of the 286 dropouts usually received several major types of help. Numbers of pupils helped are non-additive.

personnel" and "parent conference held." Evidence of provision of specific programs and activities needs to be indicated as "major efforts" to assist dropouts.

General Characteristics

Beginning with Table IV-A, all data are based on the 200 sample dropouts still out of school. Findings are very similar to those of last year's. Table IV-A shows that almost two-thirds of the dropouts are male. Based on the known cases of religious affiliations, Protestant and Catholic groups are found to be predominate. Among the ethnic groups, part Hawaiian and Hawaiians comprise the largest numbers (of all known cases).

About half of the dropouts are from the Honolulu district, a large and disproportionate share of the total for all the school districts (the total grade 9-12 enrollment for the Honolulu district accounts for 34.6 per cent of the state grade 9-12 enrollment). The number of dropouts from the rural schools does not exceed its share of the state grade 9-12 enrollment. The neighbor island school districts fall far below their share of the enrollment.

Status at Time of Exit

National statistics continue to report dropouts as typically tenth grade students of 16 years of age. Table IV-A shows that, last year, tenth graders comprised the largest group of dropouts. However, it appears that Hawaii's dropouts remain in school somewhat longer than those nationally. The difference between tenth (37.5%) and eleventh grade (34.5%) dropouts is only 3.0 per cent.

Age-grade placement of dropouts shows 47.0 per cent at the proper grade level for their age, 29.5 per cent one year below the expected grade level, and

Table IV-A

General Characteristics of Sample Dropouts (Gr. 9-12, 1966-67) Who Are Still Out of School

	Number	Per Cent
Total	200	100.0
Male	128	64.0
Female	72	36.0
Religious Preference		
Protestant (includes Mormon)	35	17.5
Catholic	28	14.0
Buddhist	4	2.0
No preference indicated/No Data	133	66.5
Ethnic Group of Natural Father		
Part-Hawaiian, Hawaiian	54	27.0
Filipino	26	13.0
Caucasian (General)	25	12.5
Japanese	18	9.0
Portuguese	18	9.0
Puerto-Rican	10	5.0
Chinese	5	2.5
Other	7	3.5
No Data	37	18.5
Geographical Area of School Where Dropped		
Honolulu	113	56.5
Rural Oahu	63	31.5
Neighbor Island	24	12.0

Table V-A

School Status at Time of Exit
Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School

	Number				Total	
	Male	Per Cent	Female	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Grade Level						
9	14	7.0	7	3.5	21	10.5
10	47	23.5	28	14.0	75	37.5
11	43	21.5	26	13.0	69	34.5
12	24	12.0	11	5.5	35	17.5
Median: Grade 10						
Age						
14	1	.5	3	1.5	4	2.0
15	19	9.5	10	5.0	29	14.5
16	29	14.5	26	13.0	55	27.5
17	45	22.5	23	11.5	68	34.0
18	17	8.5	8	4.0	25	12.5
19	16	8.0	--		16	8.0
20	1	.5	1	.5	2	1.0
21	--		--		--	
22	--		1	.5	1	.5
Median: Age 17						
Age-Grade Placement (Years Above or Below)						
3 or more years below					14	7.0
2 years below					37	18.5
1 year below					59	29.5
At grade level					90	45.0
1 or more years above					--	----

Median: 1 year below grade level

Table V-A (cont'd)

	Number	Per Cent
Month of Exit		
September	5	2.5
October	12	6.0
November	31	15.5
December	15	7.5
January	27	13.5
Total: 1st Semester	90	45.0
February	25	12.5
March	42	21.0
April	30	15.0
May	10	5.0
June	3	1.5
Total: 2nd Semester	110	55.0
Attendance - Per Cent Absent During Year of Exit (per cent based on number of days enrolled prior to dropping out)		
86% or more	7	3.5
56 - 85%	27	13.5
46 - 55%	19	9.5
16 - 45%	70	35.0
15% or less	17	8.5
No Data	60	30.0

Table V-A (cont'd)

Per Cent Courses Failed at Last Report	Number	Per Cent
0%	22	11.0
10 - 19%	11	5.5
20 - 29%	6	3.0
30 - 39%	3	1.5
40 - 49%	8	4.0
50 - 59%	14	7.0
60 - 69%	9	4.5
70 - 79%	5	2.5
80 - 89%	8	4.0
90 - 99%	--	----
100%	73	36.5
No Data	41	20.5
Median (Based on the 159 known cases):	82%	
Physical Handicaps Noted		
None Recorded	182	91.0
Recorded	18	9.0

none above. Data on the "month of exit" may not be as critically significant as other data. Again this year, more dropouts were recorded for the month of March (21.0 per cent) than for any other month. Though there were no complete attendance data for 60 dropouts, available statistics show a much too high rate of absenteeism among the dropouts.

Rather than reporting the number of courses failed at the last report (since the number of courses pursued differ from one individual to another), the "per cent of courses failed at last report" is presented. Failing 100 per cent are 36.5 per cent of the dropouts. Failing grades were, in many cases, automatically given to pupils who, due to unexcused absence, had not completed required work within the period prior to leaving school. This may account for the substantial number of dropouts failing 100 per cent of their courses.

This year, about 3.0 per cent more dropouts (9.0 per cent) are reported to be physically handicapped. Significant degrees of interference to classroom learning result from even the slightest physical handicap; therefore, such information is of critical relevance to any study on dropout problems.

Ability and Achievement in Elementary School

The academic achievement of dropouts falls low when compared with statewide averages. Test scores on I.Q. and achievement of third and fourth grade years can serve as early predictors of academic problems of high school years. Table VI-A shows ability and achievement test scores for the sample dropouts when they were in grade 3 and 4 (the State testing program at the time required the first ability testing--California Test of Mental Maturity--in the third grade, and the first achievement testing--California Achievement Test--in the fourth grade). Again consistent with the first year's findings, scores are skewed to the right of the normal curve. The median I.Q. of 91 for the dropouts remains the same. A comparison of the distribution of I.Q. scores for these dropouts and the average of the State's third graders in 1960-61 to 1962-63 shows the following:

Third Grade IQ's of Dropouts		3-Year Average of all Third Graders 1960-61 to 1962-63
	Per Cent	Per Cent
70 and below	3.3	1.5
71 - 75	6.6	1.5
76 - 80	14.5	2.0
81 - 85	8.6	5.0
86 - 90	15.1	10.0
91 - 95	11.8	10.0
96 - 100	14.5	15.0
101 - 105	10.5	10.0
106 - 110	7.2	10.0
111 - 115	4.6	15.0
116 and above	3.3	20.0
Dropout Median IQ (based on the 152 known cases): 91 Grade 3		Statewide Median IQ: 103 Grade 3

In achievement testing results, the group scores are again found to be consistent with the first year's findings. A comparison of the distribution of grade placement scores (total scores) for the sample dropouts and the average of the State's fourth graders in 1960-61 to 1962-63 shows the following:

Fourth Grade GP's of Dropouts (Total Scores)		3-Year Average of All Fourth Graders 1960-61 to 1962-63 (Total Scores)
2.0 or below	1.6	Less than 1%
2.1 - 2.9	20.5	10%
3.0 - 3.8	43.5	30%
3.9 - 4.1	9.8	10%
4.2 or more	24.6	50%
Dropout Median GP (Based on the 122 known cases): 3.5 Grade 4		Statewide Median GP: 4.4 Grade 4

The median reading grade placement score for the dropouts falls slightly lower than the median for total scores. A comparison of the distribution of reading grade placement scores between the sample dropouts and the average of the State's fourth graders in 1960-61 to 1962-63 shows:

Fourth Grade Reading GP's of Dropouts		3-Year Average of All Fourth Graders 1960-61 to 1962-63 Reading GP's
2.0 or below	3.3	1%
2.1 - 2.9	29.5	14%
3.0 - 3.8	33.6	20%
3.9 - 4.1	5.7	10%
4.2 or more	27.9	55%
Dropout Reading GP Median (Based on the 122 known cases): 3.4		Statewide Reading GP Median: 4.4

Table VI-A

Elementary School Standardized Test Scores for Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School

	CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Grade 3	Other Total Test IQ Scores [a]	All Total Test IQ Scores	
	Number	Number	Number	Per Cent
70 and below	5	--	5	2.5
71 - 75	9	1	10	5.0
76 - 80	20	2	22	11.0
81 - 85	11	2	13	6.5
86 - 90	18	5	23	11.5
91 - 95	13	5	18	9.0
96 - 100	20	2	22	11.0
101 - 105	13	3	16	8.0
106 - 110	10	1	11	5.5
111 - 115	4	3	7	3.5
116 and above	3	2	5	2.5
No Data			48	24.0
Median (based on the 152 known cases): 91				

CAT Grade Placement, Grade 4

Statewide	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	4	2.0	2	1.0
2.1 - 2.9	36	18.0	25	12.5
3.0 - 3.8	41	20.5	53	26.5
3.9 - 4.1	7	3.5	12	6.0
4.2 and above	34	17.0	30	15.0
No Data	78	39.0	78	39.0
Median (based on the 122 known cases): Reading 3.4, Total 3.5				

---

[a] For those records that lacked a CTMM Grade 3 IQ Score, the earliest score for an IQ test taken during elementary school was listed under this column. As it turned out, of the 48 individuals who did not have a CTMM Grade 3 IQ Score, 26 had "Other IQ Scores" and these were combined with the 126 who had the CTMM Grade 3 Score under the column "All Total Test IQ Scores."

Table VI-A (cont'd)

Difference between Actual Achievement (based on CAT, grade 4) and Anticipated Achievement (based on CTMM, grade 3)

Statewide	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
-1.1 and below	8	4.0	2	1.0
-.6 to -1.0	9	4.5	6	3.0
Even to -.5	15	7.5	20	10.0
+.1 to +.5	5	2.5	11	5.5
+.6 or above	12	6.0	10	5.0
No Data	151	75.5	151	75.5

Median (based on the 49 known cases): Reading -.3, Total -.4

Elementary School Standardized Test Scores for Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School

Honolulu District	CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Grade 3	Other Total Test IQ Scores[a]	All Total Test IQ Scores	
	Number	Number	Number	Per Cent
70 and below	3	--	3	2.7
71 - 75	3	--	3	2.7
76 - 80	11	2	13	11.5
81 - 85	4	--	4	3.5
86 - 90	13	5	18	15.9
91 - 95	4	2	6	5.3
96 - 100	12	2	14	12.5
101 - 105	9	1	10	8.8
106 - 110	5	1	6	5.3
111 - 115	1	--	1	.9
116 and above	1	1	2	1.7
No Data			33	29.2

Median (based on the 80 known cases): 90

Table VI-A (cont'd)

Rural Oahu	CTMM Number	Other Number	All Total Number	All Total Per Cent
70 and below	1	-	1	1.6
71 - 75	3	1	4	6.4
76 - 80	5	-	5	7.9
81 - 85	2	2	4	6.3
86 - 90	5	-	5	7.9
91 - 95	8	3	11	17.5
96 - 100	5	-	5	7.9
101 - 105	4	2	6	9.5
106 - 110	3	-	3	4.8
111 - 115	3	3	6	9.5
116 and above	2	1	3	4.8
No Data			10	15.9
Median (based on the 53 known cases): 93				

Neighbor Islands	CTMM Number	Other Number	All Total Number	All Total Per Cent
70 and below	1	-	1	4.2
71 - 75	3	-	3	12.5
76 - 80	4	-	4	16.7
81 - 85	5	-	5	20.8
86 - 90	-	-	-	----
91 - 95	1	-	1	4.2
96 - 100	3	-	3	12.5
101 - 105	-	-	-	----
106 - 110	2	-	2	8.3
111 - 115	-	-	-	----
116 and above	-	-	-	----
No Data			5	20.8
Median (based on the 19 known cases): 82				

Table VI-A (cont'd)

CAT Grade Placement, Grade 4

Honolulu	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	1	.8	-	-
2.1 - 2.9	16	14.2	11	9.7
3.0 - 3.8	22	19.5	28	24.8
3.9 - 4.1	5	4.4	7	6.2
4.2 and above	22	19.5	20	17.7
No Data	47	41.6	47	41.6

Median (based on the 66 known cases): Reading 3.6, Total 3.6

Rural Oahu	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	2	3.2	2	3.2
2.1 - 2.9	14	22.2	10	15.9
3.0 - 3.8	15	23.8	17	27.0
3.9 - 4.1	2	3.2	5	7.9
4.2 and above	7	11.1	6	9.5
No Data	23	36.5	23	36.5

Median (based on the 40 known cases): Reading 3.2, Total 3.4

Neighbor Islands	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	1	4.2	-	-
2.1 - 2.9	6	25.0	4	16.7
3.0 - 3.8	4	16.7	8	33.3
3.9 - 4.1	-	-	-	-
4.2 and above	5	20.8	4	16.7
No Data	8	33.3	8	33.3

Median (based on the 16 known cases): Reading 3.2, Total 3.4

Table VI-A (cont'd)

Difference between Actual Achievement (based on CAT, grade 4)
and Anticipated Achievement (based on CTMM, grade 3)

Honolulu	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
-1.1 and below	4	3.5	1	.9
-.6 to -1.0	3	2.6	5	4.4
Even to -.5	12	10.6	10	8.8
+.1 to +.5	3	2.7	8	7.1
+.6 or above	8	7.1	6	5.3
No Data	83	73.5	83	73.5

Median (based on the 30 known cases): Reading -.3, Total -.5

Rural Oahu	No.	%	No.	%
-1.1 and below	2	3.2	1	1.6
-.6 to -1.0	4	6.3	1	1.6
Even to -.5	2	3.2	6	9.5
+.1 to +.5	2	3.2	2	3.2
+.6 or above	2	3.2	2	3.2
No Data	51	80.9	51	80.9

Median (based on the 12 known cases): Reading -1.0, Total -.3

Neighbor Islands	No.	%	No.	%
-1.1 and below	2	8.3	-	-
-.6 to -1.0	2	8.3	-	-
Even to -.5	1	4.2	4	16.6
+.1 to +.5	-	-	1	4.2
+.6 or above	2	8.3	2	8.3
No Data	17	70.9	17	70.9

Median (based on the 7 known cases): Reading -.9, Total -.4

Findings on the difference between actual achievement (based on CAT, grade 4) and anticipated achievement (based on CTMM, grade 3) for 1967 dropouts (with -.3 for reading and -.4 for total scores) closely follow those of 1966 (with -.4 for reading and -.3 for total scores).

School History

Table VII-A gives information on dropout factors traceable from elementary grades to high school. These factors include attendance, academic performance, character trait ratings, and anecdotal records. The table on attendance shows that dropouts were absent (more than 8 per cent of total school days in session for the year) in greatest numbers in grades one, two, eight, nine, ten, and eleven.

Of the grade levels at which retentions occurred, grades one and eleven show the greatest numbers of retentions on a statewide basis. Those dropouts who never failed at any grade level number 96 (48.0 per cent).

Table VII-A

School History, Elementary to Secondary of Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School

Attendance: Grade Level Dropouts Were Absent
More Than 8 Per Cent of Total School Days by
Number[a]/ and Per Cent

Grade	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
Level	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1	38	33.6	27	42.9	12	50.0	77	38.5
2	38	33.6	27	42.9	8	33.3	73	36.5
3	31	27.4	18	28.6	8	33.3	57	28.5
4	29	25.7	18	28.6	5	20.8	52	26.0
5	30	26.5	15	23.8	7	29.2	52	26.0
6	27	23.9	17	27.0	6	25.0	50	25.0
7	32	28.3	15	23.8	6	25.0	53	26.5
8	42	37.2	24	38.1	8	33.3	74	37.0
9	48	42.5	33	52.4	10	41.7	91	45.5
10	51	45.1	27	42.9	13	54.2	91	45.5
11	22	19.5	22	34.9	8	33.3	52	26.0
12	8	7.1	13	20.6	1	4.2	22	11.0
None[b]/	4	3.5	-	-	-	-	4	2.0
No Data	10	8.8	2	3.2	1	4.2	13	6.5

---

[a]/These numbers are non-additive. If an individual were absent more than 8 per cent of the time in three grades or were retained in three grades, all three were tallied.

[b]/Number of individuals who were never absent more than 8 per cent of the time or never failed a grade.

[c]/Most character ratings were on the 3-point scale.

Table VII-A (cont'd)

Failures: Grade Level Dropouts Were Retained, by Number[a] and Per Cent

Grade Level	Honolulu Number	Honolulu Per Cent	Rural Oahu Number	Rural Oahu Per Cent	Neighbor Island Number	Neighbor Island Per Cent	State Total Number	State Total Per Cent
1	8	7.1	4	6.3	2	8.3	14	7.0
2	2	1.8	2	3.2	-	-	4	2.0
3	1	.8	2	3.2	-	-	3	1.5
4	1	.8	1	1.6	-	-	2	1.0
5	2	1.8	2	3.2	1	4.2	5	2.5
6	2	1.8	2	3.2	1	4.2	5	2.5
7	-	-	1	1.6	-	-	1	.5
8	6	5.3	1	1.6	-	-	7	3.5
9	4	3.5	5	7.9	1	4.2	10	5.0
10	12	10.6	7	11.1	1	4.2	20	10.0
11	4	3.5	4	6.3	3	12.5	11	5.5
12	3	2.7	-	-	-	-	3	1.5
None[b]	53	46.9	29	46.0	14	58.3	96	48.0
No Data	7	6.2	7	11.1	3	12.5	17	8.5

Table VII-A (cont'd)

Academic Performance, by School Level

	Elementary (Grade 1-6)		Intermediate (Grade 7-9)		High School (Grade 10-12)	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Good or Better (Predominate A's, B's, +'s, or E's)	2	1.0	2	1.0	1	.5
Satisfactory (Predominate C's, √'s, or S's)	80	40.0	41	20.5	7	3.5
Poor or Worse (Predominate D's, F's, -'s, or U's)	59	29.5	142	71.0	145	72.5
No Data	59	29.5	15	7.5	47	23.5

Character Trait Ratings, by School Level

	Elementary (Grade 1-6)		Secondary (Grade 7-12)	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Above Average (Predominate 1's)[c]	1	.5	---	----
Average (Predominate 2's)	85	42.5	55	27.5
Below Average (Predominate 3's)	61	30.5	112	56.0
No Data	53	26.5	33	16.5

Number of Disciplinary Notations Found in Records, by School

	Elementary (Grade 1-6)		Secondary (Grade 7-12)	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
5 or more	2	1.0	79	39.5
3 to 4	5	2.5	12	6.0
1 to 2	9	4.5	26	13.0
None Found	125	62.5	67	33.5
No Data	59	29.5	16	8.0

It is significant that at the high school level only 3.5 per cent of the dropouts received "satisfactory" marks for academic performance as compared to 40.0 per cent of dropouts who received "satisfactory" rating at the elementary level. Conversely, the number with "poor" marks rises from 29.5 per cent in elementary to 72.5 per cent in high school.

Are such marked differences between grades received in the elementary grades and high school years indicative of a mere technical problem such as inconsistent grading standards or of serious weaknesses in educational practices at both levels? Are elementary school pupils moved along year after year with "satisfactory" or passing grades regardless of below-standard achievement and recognition of their limited ability? If so, should such practices be continued at the secondary level for these pupils whose achievement potential has been proven to be unquestionably limited and who can not measure up to the quality of class performance expected of all other students of average and superior ability, especially in "required" courses for high school graduation? Should there be more drastic steps taken at the elementary levels in terms of curriculum adjustment such as special concentration in the area of language arts (which appears to be one of the major academic areas of weaknesses of students with "unsatisfactory" or poor grades), or should retention at elementary grade levels be accepted as standard practice when physical and social immaturity appear to be obvious blocks to learning or when achievement is below expectation? As acclaimed by the proponents of the non-graded school system, the stigma attached to this kind of practice can perhaps be eased to some extent through "non-grading."

For character trait ratings fewer dropouts (27.5 per cent) received "average" rating at the high school level than at the elementary level (42.5 per cent). The percentage of dropouts receiving "below average" increased sharply from the elementary level (30.5 per cent) to high school (56.0 per cent). (Character traits include personal and social attitudes, health and safety habits, work habits, industry, initiative, concern for others, leadership, and responsibility.)

It appears that discipline problems become more pronounced and urgent as students progress in grade levels. This is evidenced by the greater number of disciplinary notations found at the secondary level than at the elementary level.

Family Background

Most studies on the problem of early school withdrawal stress the importance of family background: educational level of parents, socio-economic status of family, size of family, occupation of parents, and permanency of residence in school district.

Table VIII-A presents family background information by the geographical areas of the state, Honolulu (Honolulu school district), Rural Oahu (Leeward, Central, and Windward school districts), and the Neighbor Islands (Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai school districts). For Honolulu and Rural Oahu the median educational level of both fathers and mothers falls at the ninth grade level. Only the median for neighbor island fathers (grade 7) falls lower than that of the rest.

Information on the number of siblings of dropouts includes all siblings

Table VIII-A

Family Background, by Geographical Areas

Highest Grade Completed by Father	Honolulu Number	Honolulu Per Cent	Rural Oahu Number	Rural Oahu Per Cent	Neighbor Island Number	Neighbor Island Per Cent	State Total Number	State Total Per Cent
Grades 0 - 2	-	-	1	1.6	-	-	1	.5
3 - 4	2	1.8	1	1.6	2	8.3	5	2.5
5 - 6	6	5.3	4	6.3	6	25.0	16	8.0
7 - 8	19	16.8	12	19.0	4	16.7	35	17.5
9 - 10	15	13.3	15	23.8	3	12.5	33	16.5
11 - 12	23	20.3	11	17.5	4	16.7	38	19.0
13 - 14	3	2.7	-	-	-	-	3	1.5
15 - 16	5	4.4	1	1.6	-	-	6	3.0
No Data	40	35.4	18	28.6	5	20.8	63	31.5
Median (based on known cases):	9		9		7		9	

Highest Grade Completed by Mother	Honolulu Number	Honolulu Per Cent	Rural Oahu Number	Rural Oahu Per Cent	Neighbor Island Number	Neighbor Island Per Cent	State Total Number	State Total Per Cent
Grades 0 - 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 - 4	-	-	2	3.2	-	-	2	1.0
5 - 6	3	2.7	3	4.7	1	4.2	7	3.5
7 - 8	22	19.5	10	15.9	4	16.7	36	18.0
9 - 10	18	15.9	19	30.2	8	33.3	45	22.5
11 - 12	29	25.7	10	15.8	8	33.3	47	23.5
13 - 14	7	6.2	-	-	-	-	7	3.5
15 - 16	1	.8	1	1.6	-	-	2	1.0
No Data	33	29.2	18	28.6	3	12.5	54	27.0
Median (based on known cases):	9		9		9		9	

Table VIII-A (cont'd)

Individual Living With	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Both Natural Parents	61	54.0	39	61.9	13	54.1	113	56.5
Mother Only	12	10.6	3	4.8	3	12.5	18	9.0
Father Only	3	2.7	1	1.6	2	8.3	6	3.0
Mother-Stepfather	9	8.0	6	9.5	1	4.2	16	8.0
Father-Stepmother	1	.8	1	1.6	1	4.2	3	1.5
Grandparents	2	1.8	-	-	2	8.3	4	2.0
Foster Parents	1	.9	-	-	1	4.2	2	1.0
Relative	7	6.2	5	7.9	1	4.2	13	6.5
Friends	-	-	2	3.2	-	-	2	1.0
No Data	17	15.0	6	9.5	-	-	23	11.5
Total	113	100.0	63	100.0	24	100.0	200	100.0

Years of Residence in School District Where Dropped	Honolulu Number	Honolulu Per Cent	Rural Oahu Number	Rural Oahu Per Cent	Neighbor Island Number	Neighbor Island Per Cent	State Total Number	State Total Per Cent
1 or less	28	24.8	14	22.2	2	8.3	44	22.0
2 - 3	9	7.9	11	17.5	1	4.2	21	10.5
4 - 5	8	7.1	5	7.9	1	4.2	14	7.0
6 - 7	3	2.7	8	12.7	-	-	11	5.5
8 or more	46	40.7	19	30.2	17	70.8	82	41.0
No Data	19	16.8	6	9.5	3	12.5	28	14.0
Total	113	100.0	63	100.0	24	100.0	200	100.0

Table VIII-A (cont'd)

Number of Schools Attended Outside of Feeder Unit Complex, by Geographical Areas	Honolulu Number	Honolulu Per Cent	Rural Oahu Number	Rural Oahu Per Cent	Neighbor Island Number	Neighbor Island Per Cent	State Total Number	State Total Per Cent
4 or more	16	14.2	10	15.9	5	20.9	31	15.5
3	5	4.4	6	9.5	-	-	11	5.5
2	15	13.3	8	12.7	-	-	23	11.5
1	13	11.5	10	15.9	2	8.3	25	12.5
0	31	27.4	13	20.6	14	58.3	58	29.0
No Data	33	29.2	16	25.4	3	12.5	52	26.0
Median (based on known cases)	1		1		0		1	
Socio-Economic Status (Subjective judgment except for "Public Welfare Assistance")								
Public Welfare Assistance	22	19.5	12	19.0	1	4.2	35	17.5
Below Average	39	34.5	34	54.0	20	83.3	93	46.5
Average	21	18.6	7	11.1	-	-	28	14.0
Above Average	5	4.4	3	4.8	1	4.2	9	4.5
No Data	26	23.0	7	11.1	2	8.3	35	17.5
Number of Siblings (total)								
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	4	3.5	1	1.6	1	4.2	6	3.0
2 to 3	17	15.0	12	19.0	7	29.1	36	18.0
4 to 7	48	42.5	32	50.8	12	50.0	92	46.0
8 or more	14	12.4	8	12.7	3	12.5	25	12.5
No Data	30	26.6	10	15.9	1	4.2	41	20.5
Median (based on known cases)	5		5		5		5	

Table VIII-A (cont'd)

Occupation of Father	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Professional-Managerial	2	1.8	1	1.6	-	-	3	1.5
Professional-Technical	9	8.0	2	3.2	1	4.1	12	6.0
Skilled	25	22.1	12	19.0	2	8.3	39	19.5
Clerical	1	.8	3	4.8	-	-	4	2.0
Semi-skilled	7	6.2	15	23.8	8	33.3	30	15.0
Service	17	15.0	8	12.7	2	8.3	27	13.5
Sales	1	.8	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Farmers	1	.8	1	1.6	-	-	2	1.0
Unskilled	13	11.5	7	11.1	5	7.9	25	12.5
Unemployed	5	4.4	3	4.8	1	4.2	9	4.5
No Data	32	28.3	11	17.4	5	7.9	51	25.5

regardless of their residence status at the time dropouts left school. The median number of siblings is five for all the school districts.

The dropout group consists of a few who come from middle and upper socio-economic levels. This accounts for 7.5 per cent of fathers in the "professional-managerial" and "professional-technical" occupations and for a large portion of the "skilled" group (19.5 per cent). The remaining known cases (49.0 per cent) range from unemployed and unskilled to semi-skilled and clerical occupations.

About half of the dropouts (56.5 per cent) were found to be living with both their natural parents. Other dropouts were most frequently found to be living with "mother only" (9.0 per cent) or "mother-stepfather" (8.0 per cent).

Compared to other school districts, more neighbor island dropouts (70.8 per cent) lived 8 years or more in the school district where they dropped out. For the Honolulu district 24.8 per cent of the dropouts resided one year or less in the district where dropping out occurred; the Rural Oahu district compared similarly with 22.2 per cent. The median number of schools attended outside of the feeder unit complex was zero for the Neighbor Island dropouts and one for Honolulu and Rural Oahu dropouts.

With the assistance of the Department of Social Services it was possible to identify the public welfare cases from among the sample dropouts. The public welfare cases account for 17.5 per cent of the dropouts. With an additional 46.5 per cent of the dropouts in the below average socio-economic group, it can be concluded here that Hawaii dropouts, like other state and regional dropouts come largely from families of low socio-economic status. The socio-economic status of the dropouts and their families was determined largely on the basis of fathers' occupations or employment status (if working or not). Other related factors affecting judgment were educational level of parents, socio-economic location of home within the community, anecdotal records, and correspondence between outside agencies and the school and between agencies and the family.

List of Job Classifications

Semi-skilled Workers - People who drive trucks, busses, taxis, work in canneries, make clothing, manufacture goods, work in a laundry, operate equipment in a sugar mill, etc.

Clerical Workers - People who keep records in an office, ring up sales on a store cash register, are messengers, file clerks, secretaries, bookkeepers, mail carriers, bank tellers, telephone operators, office machine operators, etc.

Skilled Workers - People who are carpenters, painters, plumbers, bricklayers and masons, structural steel workers, sheetmetal workers, construction workers, electricians, journeymen, etc.

Professional & Technical Workers - People such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, clergymen, architects, draftsmen, librarians, photographers, nurses, etc.

Professional & Managerial - People in business for themselves, sales managers, big store managers, personnel managers, company presidents, people in charge of operations, etc.

Service Workers - People who are waiters, janitors, hospital attendants, barbers, travel guides, beauticians, public servants, etc.

Sales Workers - Automobile salesmen, insurance salesmen, sales people in store, people selling goods to the general public, etc.

Unskilled Workers - People involved in the moving, lifting and carrying of materials, digging, and occupations generally requiring no special training--laborers in the pineapple and sugar industries, etc.

Farmers & Farm Managers - Owners of dairies, vegetable farms, livestock ranches, etc.

Unemployed

The Curriculum and the Dropout

In order to assess the academic background and experiences of the dropouts, grade slips, records, and transcripts were examined and data extracted as shown in Table IX-A and X-A. It is clearly evident from Table IX-A that grade nine dropouts had rarely reached half-way through their courses. Course completions are almost nil. This is attributed to failure in course work and/or incomplete semester's work (because of early termination or non-attendance). As expected, the average number of courses completed by each dropout increased with each additional year in school. For example, the average number of business education courses for grade 11 dropouts more than doubled that of grade 9, and grade 12 doubled that of grade 11.

Table X-A compares the sample dropout group with the total secondary population in enrollment distribution in the various subject areas. The distribution pattern for the dropouts would be expected to follow that of the total population. (The five most heavily enrolled subjects include "required courses for graduation.") However, differences are readily noticeable in percentages and in the rank order of certain subjects in enrollment concentration. These differences are mainly in the areas of foreign language and health and physical education. Health and physical education for the dropouts ranks second rather than fourth as it does for the total population. Dropouts complete and pass HPE courses more frequently than other subject area courses. Foreign language for the dropouts ranks fourteenth; whereas, for the total population it ranks eighth. Elective courses such as foreign languages are not readily pursued by dropouts. This may be due to their limited ability; also, the dropouts are probably unable to carry the burden of any more additional courses beyond those required for graduation.

In the non-academic subject areas, industrial arts, home economics, agriculture, and other miscellaneous courses show greater percentages of enrollment for the dropouts. Art courses show lower enrollment proportionately. Perhaps these are the very courses that should be explored and used to provide opportunities and ways of engendering or re-establishing pupil interest in school.

Clearly evident in the review of courses pursued by dropouts is the need for ways to minimize "academic failure" and "disinterest in school." Of special concern here for the academically less capable dropout is the problem of curriculum flexibility--adjustment in content and course presentation through appropriate instructional techniques and teaching materials. Standards of expectations in academic achievement also need to be flexibly structured and readily adjusted according to the ability of the pupils. Since "required" courses are mandatory for all, irrespective of ability, a student may need to be given a passing grade if he has worked to full capacity whether or not a certain level of achievement has been reached. This passing grade can be qualified with an explanatory note.

Another alternative would be to restructure some aspects of the present program of course offerings. This will require an adjustment in course titles (with an accompanying adjustment in content, materials, and teaching techniques) and provision of classes specifically set aside (according to course titles) for special students requiring special help. Schools will confer with parents on the advisability of enrollment in special classes before any definite action is taken. Implied in the adjusted course titles will be gradations in standards of achievement. Report cards and transcripts will reflect this adjustment in course titles, and accompanying grades can be interpreted accordingly.

The school needs to plan and structure the various preventive and remedial programs for potential and re-admitted dropouts with a clear understanding of the kinds of academic and social needs that are to be provided for. The following are research studies that help to pinpoint some of these curriculum needs. (See also Appendix C and D.)

Thornton and Amble examined the achievement of disadvantaged youths in both the academic and non-academic subject areas:[a/]

> The findings in this investigation provide little support for a conclusion that after eight or more years of schooling, disadvantaged children will have incidently acquired favorable attitudes and understanding with reference to child development, activities and behavior patterns. If a future syndrome of unfortunate parent-child interactions are to be altered within the school setting, it behooves curriculum planners to develop formal programs in child growth and development as part of the regular educational process. Clearly this would lend itself to better family, school and community adjustment for many children.
>
> The findings also indicated that culturally disadvantaged students do not sufficiently understand the activities of children, nor do they compensate for low scholastic ability by excellence in nonlanguage oriented activities. The Low Achievers had less knowledge of sports and games, and tended to have less capacity to excel at physical tasks than Average Achievers. Apparently these students will need to be systematically instructed if they are to understand children's activities which are often learned incidentally by their classmates.
>
> Children from culturally disadvantaged homes were not culturalized as an incidental outcome of the school program. Some reassessment of training programs was indicated.

The negative effect of status deprivation in academic and social areas upon the academically capable, lower-class youth is evident according to

---

[a/] Thornton, Sam M. and Bruce R. Amble, "Achievement of Disadvantaged Children in Critical, Non-Academic Areas," The Journal of Educational Research, 61:125, November 1967

Elliot, Voss, and Wendling:[b]

> In most high schools, youth from diverse socio-economic backgrounds are thrown together and forced to compete as equals. Status, measured primarily in terms of grades and academic success, is awarded on the basis of middle-class standards. The socialization of lower-class youth does not adequately prepare them to perform according to the requirements of middle-class institutions such as the school. While many lower-class youth may have the requisite ability to succeed at school, in the sense of doing passing work, they are more likely to be defined as "problem children" because their values, attitudes, modes of expression, vocabulary, and perhaps clothing styles differ sharply from those of middle-class teachers.
>
> Lower-class socialization does not produce school-oriented children. Being poorly prepared, they fail to obtain status in the formal hierarchy of the school where status is measured primarily in terms of grades and academic success.

The importance of providing for extra class activities within the school curriculum is discussed in Bell's recent study on dropouts:[c]

> This is a report of a study to determine the relationship of participation in extra class activities and dropouts in Kansas high schools of varying enrollments. The results supported other studies which show that lack of participation in school activities is a significant characteristic of the dropout.
>
> It seems reasonable, on the basis of the reported differences, that school personnel should make new or continued efforts to involve more students in the activity program. A meaningful experience in an activity of his own choice can make the difference between a dropout or a high-school graduate.

---

[b] Elliott, Delbert S., "Capable Dropouts and the Social Milieu of the High School," The Journal of Educational Research, 60:181-82, December 1966

[c] Bell, James W., "A Comparison of Dropouts and Nondropouts on Participation in School Activities," The Journal of Educational Research, 60:248-51, February 1967

The most recent 1967 report by the National Education Association, School Dropouts, states that nearly all studies investigating the factor of non-participation in extracurricular activities found this factor to be characteristic of the school dropout. The following studies were cited:

> Daniel W. Snepp: 79 per cent of the dropouts "avoided" extracurricular activites.
>
> Harold J. Dillon: 798 dropouts, 73 per cent had never participated in an extracurricular school activity, one-fourth had participated in one or two, and only 2 per cent in two or more.
>
> Floyd W. Sullivan: 52 per cent of the boys and 43 per cent of the girls had not participated in any outside-class activities.
>
> L. A. Van Dyke: Dropouts averaged 1.6 fewer activities than graduates. The greatest difference in participation was between graduates and dropouts in grades 11 and 12.
>
> Dale G. Hamreus: Dropouts participated in fewer school activities and clubs than stayins when both groups were matched on sex, IQ, and socioeconomic status.

Saterlie suggests emergency curriculum changes for the prevention of dropouts:[d]

> The emergency curriculum would be a stop-gap procedure for potential dropouts who are nearing legal dropout age. Its purpose would be to give him "advice and skills that will immediately equip him to enter the world outside of school." Language arts courses would include remedial and "survival" reading (of forms, directions), writing skills (for letters of application), and only functional grammar. Social studies courses would include a study of community resources and the responsibility of the citizen in local and national undertakings. Mathematics and science courses would also be relevant to the outside world (consumership, banking, tax payments, budget, etc.). Curriculum in industrial arts, home economics, music and art, and physical education would also be closely related to student needs.

On the subject of the academically capable dropouts and their quality of school work, Wendling relates the following:[e]

---

[d] Saterlie, Mary E., "Realistic Studies for Potential Dropouts" quoted in National Education Association, School Dropouts (Washington, 1967), p.41

[e] Wendling, A., "Some Types of High School Dropouts," The Journal of Educational Research 59:366-67, April 1966

A student who is a capable dropout might be incorrectly designated a retarded dropout on the basis of his low grades and achievement scores. His grades may, in fact, be primarily D's and F's. In such cases, the capable dropout is "flunking" for reasons connected with citizenship, lack of attendance or truancy, or the fact that he is a behavioral problem in school. His response to the school situation may indicate a lack of motivation, but he is not failing because he lacks ability for academic pursuits. When he does his work, it is not F work; his major difficulty is that he does not do his required work.

"Lack of motivation" as cited above can perhaps be more fully understood within the context of Shaw's comprehensive study on motivation:[f/]

> The confusion which exists in the field of motivation and that which exists in the field of learning is compounded by some unknown but significant factor when attempts to study the role of motivation in learning are made.
>
> Research in motivation as it relates to learning appears to be approximately equally divided between two broad areas. The first includes motivational factors which are ordinarily assumed to be personal or intrinsic to the individual, and the second category includes those motivational factors which are usually assumed to be determined by the situational context in which learning takes place.

Within the category of "intrinsic influences on motivation," Shaw lists four general areas which have received the greatest attention in recent years: 1) relationship between drive, as manifested by anxiety, and learning, 2) relationships between the variable of the "need to achieve" and other characteristics presumed to be related to motivation, 3) relationship between self-concept and academic achievement, and 4) relationships of aspirations and expectancies to motivation.

[f/] Shaw, Merville C., "Motivation in Human Learning," Review of Educational Research 37:563-71, December 1967

Shaw categorizes "environmental influences on motivation" into two broad types:

> The first category consists of what might most properly be called immediate environmental factors and includes those motivational forces specific to a given situation, such as those exercised deliberately by an experimenter or a teacher. The second type of influence can be presumed to include the more pervasive and general characteristics of the environment..."social-cultural factors." Such factors include those exerted by socioeconomic status, family, and peers.

According to Shaw, the social role of the teacher (as the social reinforcer of learning) or the social value of the reward itself is the most significant aspect of the social reinforcement of learning. It is clearly evident that the teacher-pupil relationship is only one of many environmental and personal factors that influence motivation. In spite of all the many factors that seemingly influence or limit the motivational pattern of students (with poor motivation), it is a challenge for school personnel to bring about a sufficient degree of motivation for the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and all other aspects of learning.

Schools on local and national levels are experimenting with work-experience programs when traditional high school programs have been found to be inadequate in helping potential and re-enrolled dropouts. Leighbody[g/] reports a study made of experimental programs developed in communities of New York and other states designed to provide more adequately for youngsters of high school age who have special educational needs. These programs make use of certain aspects of vocational education to assist these young people to achieve general and vocational goals. The following is reported:

[g/] Leighbody, Gerald B., Vocational Education for Youth with Special Needs, New York State School Boards Association, Inc., New York, September 1967

By changing the nature of the tasks through the introduction of occupationally-related activities and actual work experience, the programs involved in this study have made it possible for these students to tolerate and even enjoy their school experience. This at least provides them with the opportunity to benefit from further exposure to general education, which will be of increasing importance to their work and nonwork life. In the programs studied, the occupationally related activities are used chiefly as a vehicle or device for accomplishing general educational objectives, not primarily as job training or vocational training in the traditional sense.

All of the programs make use of semi-skilled and service type occupations to provide prevocational experiences. For the boys, such occupations as building maintenance, small power equipment repair, helper level construction skills, auto body repair, and landscaping and maintenance of grounds are typical. For the girls, the typical job areas are retail selling, cashiering, practical aides (nursing and home) and food preparation and service.

Elaborate equipment in the school is not needed for the programs tend toward the use of hand tools and simple power tools. Facilities and equipment are in most cases those of a general industrial arts shop for the boys. For the girls, an area fitted out with equipment appropriate for the work being taught is all that is necessary. This may be basic food preparation and storage equipment, retail store equipment, a nursery school setting, or simple health care equipment.

Teaching tends to be informal and individual. Groups are small, in most cases 10 to 15 students. There is little group instruction. The highly structured, systematic, formal instruction based on job analysis which characterizes an advanced vocational shop program is not suited to the type of student these programs serve.

Staffing for programs of this kind requires a relatively high ratio of professional staff to students. Much remedial and social rehabilitation work is involved and students require more individual time of the staff members than is usually provided for other students. Instructional supplies need to be plentiful and varied. Often they have to be created or adapted in order to instruct this type of pupil. This also consumes staff time.

Students of the slow-learning or alienated type frequently have special needs for personal, health and social services in order to improve their ability to profit from instruction. Such services may call for more than the usual allocation of the time of counselors, psychologists, physicians, school social workers and reading specialists. The programs are unlikely to succeed unless these services are provided.

Table IX-A

Courses Pursued (One-Half to Full Completion of Courses)
by Sample Dropouts Who Are Still Out of School
by Number* and Grade Level

Courses	Grade 9 Dropouts (21) No.	Grade 10 Dropouts (75) No.	Grade 11 Dropouts (69) No.	Grade 12 Dropouts (35) No.
Agriculture				
Agricultural Arts	1	1	4	-
Floriculture	-	-	1	1
Horticulture 1 & 2	-	3	6	6
Vocational Agric. 1 & 2	-	1	7	5
Practical Arts	-	-	1	-
Total	1	5	19	12
Art				
Advertising Art 1 & 2	-	-	-	1
Basic Art 1 & 2	-	7	8	7
Basic Art 3 & 4	-	-	1	-
Drawing & Painting	-	2	1	-
Crafts, Exploratory	-	3	-	-
Photography	-	-	1	-
Sculpture & Ceramics 1 & 2				1
Total	-	12	11	9

---

*Numbers are presented here mainly to show a distributive pattern of the dropouts' enrollment in the various courses and subject areas. Enrolled courses, elected and required, are all included. The numbers for each course and subject area give some indication of the overall scope and limitations of the dropouts' background and experiences.

Table IX-A (cont'd)

Courses	Grade 9 Dropouts (21) No.	Grade 10 Dropouts (75) No.	Grade 11 Dropouts (69) No.	Grade 12 Dropouts (35) No.
Business Education				
Bookkeeping 1 & 2	-	-	-	5
General Business	-	-	4	3
Business Math	-	2	1	4
Office Practice	-	-	2	1
Typing, Beg. 1 & 2	-	12	20	18
Typing 3 & 4	-	-	4	7
Typing, Advanced	-	-	1	-
Typing, Personal	-	1	4	3
Total		15	36	41
Home Economics				
Home Econ. I	-	7	13	7
Home Econ. II	-	-	1	2
Clothing Appreciation	-	1	4	2
Family Cooking	-	-	-	1
Family Foods	-	1	7	6
Family Living	-	-	-	1
Personality & Dress	-	-	-	1
Total		9	25	20
Industrial Arts				
Automotive Mechanics 1 & 2	-	-	4	7
Automotive Mechanics 3 & 4	-	-	-	2
Drawing, Mechanical 1 & 2	-	2	4	4
Electricity 1 & 2	-	1	1	1
Electronics 1 & 2	-	-	-	1
Industrial Crafts 1 & 2	-	1	11	5
Industrial Crafts 3 & 4	-	-	1	-
Metals, General 1 & 2	-	4	8	3
Metals, General 3 & 4	-	-	1	2

Table IX-A (cont'd)

Courses	Grade 9 Dropouts (21) No.	Grade 10 Dropouts (75) No.	Grade 11 Dropouts (69) No.	Grade 12 Dropouts (35) No.
Industrial Arts (cont'd)				
Printing	-	-	2	-
General Shop Gr. 8 or 9	-	10	11	6
Shop, General 1 & 2	-	-	7	2
Woodwork 1 & 2	-	1	9	4
Visual Communications I	-	-	1	-
Total		19	60	37
Language Arts				
Lang. Arts, Non-graded	-	1	-	-
Expository Writing	-	-	-	1
Newswriting 3 & 4	-	-	1	-
Developmental Rdg. 1 & 2	-	9	6	7
Reading Improvement	-	7	6	3
Remedial Reading	-	2	-	1
English 1 & 2	1	49	61	34
English 3 & 4 (Gr. 10)	-	11	52	29
English 5 & 6 (Gr. 11)	-	-	6	22
English 7 & 8 (Gr. 12)	-	-	-	8
Literature	-	-	-	2
Yearbook	-	-	-	1
English as a Second Lang. Phase 6	-	-	-	-
Total	1	79	132	109
Speech				
Drama 1 & 2	1	1	2	1
Speech Fundamentals	-	13	8	7
Speech Improvement	-	-	5	-
Total	1	14	15	8

Table IX-A (cont'd)

Courses	Grade 9 Dropouts (21) No.	Grade 10 Dropouts (75) No.	Grade 11 Dropouts (69) No.	Grade 12 Dropouts (35) No.
Foreign Language				
French 1 & 2	-	1	-	2
French 3 & 4	-	1	-	1
German 1 & 2	-	-	1	-
Spanish 1 & 2	-	3	3	2
Spanish 3 & 4	-	1	-	1
Latin 1 & 2	-	-	-	1
Total	-	6	4	7
Music				
Music Appreciation	-	-	2	2
Band, Beginning	-	3	6	3
Band, Intermediate	-	1	-	-
Band, Advanced	-	1	-	-
Choral, Beginning	-	2	9	6
Choral, Intermediate	-	-	2	1
Choral, Advanced	-	-	-	5
Choral, Senior	-	-	-	1
Polynesian Instrument 1 & 2	-	-	2	1
Girls, Glee	-	-	-	1
Total		7	21	20
Mathematics				
Algebra 1 & 2	1	4	4	6
Algebra 3 & 4	-	1	-	2
Geometry, Plane	-	2	1	3
Algebra I	-	-	3	-
Math Basic 1 & 2	-	1	12	7
Math Basic 3 & 4	-	4	6	6
Math Basic 5 & 6	-	1	2	1
Math Basic 7 & 8	-	-	1	1
Math, Shop	-	-	1	1

Table IX-A (cont'd)

Courses	Grade 9 Dropouts (21) No.	Grade 10 Dropouts (75) No.	Grade 11 Dropouts (69) No.	Grade 12 Dropouts (35) No.
Mathematics (cont'd)				
Math, Grade 9	2	34	41	21
Probability	-	-	-	1
UICSM 1 & 2 I	-	-	-	1
Total	3	47	71	50
Physical Education				
Phys. Ed. 1 & 2 Girls	1	12	14	10
Phys. Ed. 1 & 2 Boys	2	36	38	22
Phys. Ed. 3 & 4 Girls	-	1	10	7
Phys. Ed. 3 & 4 Boys	-	3	35	19
Phys. Ed. 5 & 6 Girls	-	-	-	1
Phys. Ed. 5 & 6 Boys	-	-	1	3
Phys. Ed. 7 & 8 Boys	-	-	-	1
ROTC 1 & 2	-	5	8	7
ROTC 3 & 4	-	-	-	2
Health & Safety	1	11	31	25
Total	4	68	137	97
Science				
Biology I	1	3	17	11
Biology BSCS 1 & 2	-	-	4	-
Physiology	-	-	-	1
Zoology	-	-	-	1
Physical Science 1 & 2	3	27	41	27
Physical Science 3 & 4	-	-	-	1
Chemistry	-	-	-	1
Chemistry CHEMS	-	-	-	2
Total	4	30	62	44

Table IX-A (cont'd)

Courses	Grade 9 Dropouts (21) No.	Grade 10 Dropouts (75) No.	Grade 11 Dropouts (69) No.	Grade 12 Dropouts (35) No.
Social Studies				
American Problems (Gr. 12)	-	-	-	11
Social Studies, Gr. 9	1	44	53	34
Gov't. of the U.S.	-	-	-	2
Hawaiiana	-	1	1	5
Psychology	-	-	-	2
U.S. History (Gr. 11)	-	-	11	25
World Geography	-	-	4	-
World History (Gr. 10)	-	12	45	27
European History	-	-	-	1
Economics	-	1	-	-
Total	1	58	114	107
Miscellaneous				
Library Training	-	3	4	1
Office Training	1	1	2	3
Guidance, Soph.	-	5	8	3
Guidance, Jr.	-	-	1	3
Guidance, Sr.	-	-	-	2
Guidance, Gr. 9	-	-	1	1
Audio Visual	-	2	2	2
Special Motivation	-	1	1	-
School Service	-	-	-	2
Vocational Survey	-	-	2	-
Total	-	12	21	17

Table X-A

Comparison between Sample Dropouts and State Total: Distribution of Enrollment in Various Subject Areas

	No. of Course Completions* by Dropouts	Per Cent of Total Enrollment	Rank Order	1966-67 State Total Enrollment in Subject Areas**	Per Cent of Total Subject Enrollment	Rank Order
Language Arts	321	18.8	1	48,283	18.1	1
Health and PE	306	18.0	2	26,147	9.8	4
Social Studies	280	16.5	3	44,929	16.9	2
Mathematics	171	10.0	4	29,014	10.9	3
Science	140	8.3	5	24,445	9.2	5
Industrial Arts	116	6.8	6	13,374	5.0	9
Business Educ.	92	5.4	7	18,596	7.0	7
Home Economics	54	3.2	8	6,562	2.4	11
Miscellaneous	51	3.0	9	19,991	7.5	6
Music	48	2.8	10	7,161	2.7	10
Speech	38	2.2	11	5,985	2.2	12
Agriculture	37	2.2	12	3,095	1.2	14
Art	32	1.8	13	5,400	2.0	13
Foreign Language	17	1.0	14	13,525	5.1	8
Total	1703	100.0		266,507	100.0	

---

*In a number of instances, dropouts completed only one semester of a full-year course prior to dropping out.

**Statistics are extracted from: Hawaii Department of Education Office of Research, Summary Report Statewide Average Class Size, Secondary, Elementary, and Special Education by Subject.

FOLLOW-UP OF DROPOUTS

Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees

Cooperation was sought from these agencies (located in Hawaii) to identify those dropouts who had participated or who are still enrolled in these agency programs. The following tables show that as of January 15, 1968, NYC participants totaled 44 (4.4 per cent of total dropout group of 1009) out of which 9 were still continuing. Job Corps participants totaled 91 (9.1 per cent of total dropout group) with 45 still continuing as of February 21, 1968.

For those who left the NYC program, the median period of participation was 9 weeks; for Job Corps enrollees the median period was 24 weeks. The Job Corps program requires a more definite commitment on the part of applicants. Corpsmen are expected to stay in the Job Corps long enough to complete their training. Participants are required to reside at Job Corps Center. The NYC program does not provide for such in-residence training.

Listed below are the types of activities and courses provided by the agencies. Most of the dropouts enrolled in the NYC program were assigned to maintenance training at the time of data compilation.

It is evident that dropouts do seek the help of these agencies. In turn, the agencies seek out these youngsters to train and improve their chances of finding a job or to provide full or part-time work to enable enrollees to return to school.

Table XI-A

Participation of 1966-67 Dropouts in Neighborhood Youth Corps[a] and Job Corps

Effective Date	No. of Enrollees Terminating		No. of Enrollees Continuing		Total Enrollees		Per Cent of Total Dropout Population (1007)	
	NYC	Job Corps	NYC	Job Corps	NYC	Job Corps	NYC	Job Corps
1-15-68	35		9		44		4.4	
2-21-68		46		45		91		9.1

Length of Participation Prior to Termination, By Week

No. of Weeks	NYC	Job Corps for Boys[b]	Job Corps for Girls[c]
1 - 4	6	7	
5 - 8	7	1	
9 - 12	6	3	
13 - 16	4	6	1
17 - 20	3	4	
21 - 24	1	6	
25 - 28	1	-	
29 - 32	5	5	
33 - 36	-	5	
37 - 40	-	5	
41 - 44	2	1	
No Data			2
Total	35	43	3
Median	9	24	-

---

[a] Included are only out-of-school participants.

[b] Located in Hawaii.

[c] Located in various states on the mainland.

Table XI-A (cont'd)

Work Classification of NYC Enrollees

January 15, 1968

	Number of Enrollees		
Type of Aid	Terminated	Continuing	Total
Clerk	7	2	9
Conservation	1	-	1
Forestry	2	1	3
Maintenance	21	5	26
Park Ranger	1	1	2
Recreation	3	-	3
Total	35	9	44

LIST OF COURSES AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES AT JOB CORPS CENTERS

Girls (on the mainland)

Dental Assistant

Licensed Pratical Nurse

Nurses Aid

Stenographer

Typist - File Clerk

Bookkeeper

Cashier

Office Machine Operator

Telephone Operator

PBX Operator

Receptionist and Information Clerk

Library Assistant

Cosmetologist

Dressmaking

Electronic Equipment Training

Boys (in Hawaii)

Education

Building Maintenance

Plumbing

Heavy Equipment

Welding

Masonry

Conservation

Carpentry

Cooking

Office Training

Automotive

Social Welfare Recipients

Of the total sample dropout group 17.5 per cent were identified as public welfare recipients. A follow-up of these dropouts reveals that 45.7 per cent of the group were "not employed and not in school." The age of the majority of the dropouts explains readily the "not employed" status of the dropouts. A total of 85.8 per cent of the dropouts were younger than 18 at the time of dropping out. Only 20.0 per cent of the dropouts returned to school: four to high school, two to Job Corps Training Center, and one to "other" school (type unknown). The percentage of public welfare cases returning to school is 10.0 per cent lower than the 30.0 per cent of the total sample dropout group (286 randomly selected) that returned to school.

The follow-up data show that the youngsters have not taken full advantage of the opportunities made available by the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Youth Employment Center of the State Department of Labor. Either they are not aware of such opportunities or are not able to take the "first" step toward participation in or requesting assistance from such agencies. It is evident that this group urgently needs to be reached for guidance and counseling for appropriate placement back in high school or a job training institution.

Table XII-A

Sample Dropouts Who Are Public Welfare Recipients

General Characteristics

	Honolulu	Rural Oahu	Neighbor Island	Statewide	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	%
Male	12	9	1	22	62.9
Female	10	3		13	37.1
Total	22	12	1	35	100.0

Age at Time of Dropping Out

	Number		Total	Per Cent
	M	F		
14		1	1	2.8
15	8	4	12	34.3
16	4	4	8	22.9
17	5	4	9	25.8
18	3		3	8.6
19	1		1	2.8
20	1		1	2.8
Total	22	13	35	100.0

Activities Within One Year After Dropping Out

	Honolulu	Rural Oahu	Neighbor Island	Statewide	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	%
High School	2	2		4	11.4
Other School	2	1		3	8.6
Employed	2		1	3	8.6
Not Employed and Not in School	12	4		16	45.7
In Military Service	2			2	5.7
Location Unknown	2	5		7	20.0
Total	22	12	1	35	100.0

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE GRADUATES AND DROPOUTS

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (Table XIII-A)

Sex Distribution: The proportion of male and female graduates does not differ significantly from that of the dropouts. Among the graduates 35.8 per cent more males were employed and not in school; whereas, there were 28.0 per cent more males among the dropouts. Just as there are consistently more male than female dropouts, there are more male than female high school graduates terminating (temporarily for some) their education and becoming "fully employed" right after graduating from high school.

Ethnic Group of Natural Father: The proportions of graduates of Filipino and Japanese ethnic background almost double those of dropouts of similar ethnic background. A difference of 8.0 per cent is noted between part-Hawaiian/Hawaiian dropouts (27.0 per cent) and graduates (19.0 per cent). Proportions of graduates and dropouts of other ethnic backgrounds show very little difference between the graduate and dropout groups.

SCHOOL HISTORY (Table XIV-A)

Age-Grade Placement: Table XIV-A shows that in comparison with dropouts 33.3 per cent more graduates were "at grade level." In all categories graduates showed significantly less deviation from normal age-grade placement. Should not an established fact that a sizable number of dropouts are older than their grade-placement ages suggest that retention does not contribute to the prevention of dropouts?

Attendance: The attendance factor may have had some effect upon persistence in school for the special group of graduates under study. Greater percentages of dropouts than graduates were absent "more than 8 per cent of total school days" throughout the various school years.

Failures (Retentions at Grade Levels): The factor of failing in school may be decisively contributory to dropping out. For the dropouts, failing can be either a possible cause of dropping out or a result of prolonged absence and subsequent dropping out. Failing a grade, especially in the upper grades (intermediate and secondary levels), may be more detrimental than advantageous for youngsters. There is a marked statistical difference between the two groups in this area. Throughout grades 8-12, only 1.8 per cent of graduates failed. The dropouts show 25.5 per cent with retentions throughout similar grades.

Academic Performance: "Satisfactory" academic performance (as rated by teachers) is more consistently characteristic of graduates than of dropouts throughout the elementary, intermediate, and secondary school years. For grades 10-12, 47.8 per cent of the graduates received "satisfactory" (with some leaning toward "poor") whereas only 3.5 per cent of the dropouts managed to claim similar performance.

Character Trait Ratings: For the graduates, character trait ratings at the secondary level show marked improvement over those recorded for their elementary school years. A phenomenal difference of 60.0 per cent more graduates are found to be rated "average." Is this outstanding difference in attitudes and character traits between graduates and dropouts a reliable enough differentiating factor as to why one group persists and another group drops out? Do "desirable and conforming" attitudes (as expected and judged by school personnel) and other traits help students establish happier, more satisfying and constructive teacher-pupil and peer relationships that in turn help to sustain their interest in academic work and school activities? Does the reverse hold true for the dropouts whose ratings are predominately "below average?"

Unsatisfactory Last Report: The graduates show unsatisfactory (D's and F's) grades, by median, for 50.0 per cent of their courses. With inattendance and incomplete work contributing to a preponderence of failing grades, data for the dropouts show a median of 82.0 per cent of courses graded unsatisfactory.

Disciplinary Notations: The low percentage of graduates with disciplinary notes on file substantiates further, the preponderance of "satisfactory" ratings for their character traits. Of significance are 47.5 per cent more graduates than dropouts in the category of "none found." Only 1.6 per cent of the graduates' files contained five or more notations while 39.5 per cent of the dropouts appeared to have been reprimanded or counseled for disciplinary reasons five or more times.

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES (Table XV-A)

The median CTMM IQ scores of graduates (92) and dropouts (91) do not differ substantially. The dropouts' median score is affected by the inclusion of a number of more academically capable students within the dropout group. The graduate group is more homogeneous in terms of academic ability (as indicated by class rank in the lowest quintile group).

Median achievement scores (of grade four) for both groups are similar, 3.4 for reading and 3.5 for total (reading, arithmetic, and language) scores.

FAMILY BACKGROUND (Table XVI-A)

Educational Level of Parents: There is close relationship between educational levels of parents of both the graduate and dropout groups. Fathers of both groups show a median of grade 9. A difference is noted for the graduates' mothers whose median shows grade 10, one grade level higher than that of the dropouts' fathers.

Number of Siblings: The medians for both groups are the same with five siblings. Specific differences are noted only in the extreme ranges of "2-3" and "8 or more." Only 9.8 per cent of the graduates have eight or more siblings. A larger percentage of 27.2 is noted for the graduates in the 2-3 range, whereas, a smaller 18.0 per cent is recorded for the dropouts.

Occupation of Father: More of the graduates' fathers fall in the categories of skilled, semi-skilled, clerical, and sales. The spread of occupations for the graduate group is less diffused than that of the dropout group. Because a number of dropouts are from upper socio-economic levels, this accounts for the 4.8 per cent difference in the professional-technical group. In the unskilled group similar percentages are noted for both groups.

Table XIII-A

Comparison of General Characteristics between Sample Graduates and Dropouts

	Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%
Sex Distribution				
Male	125	67.9	128	64.0
Female	59	32.1	72	36.0
Total	184	100.0	200	100.0
Ethnic Group of Natural Father				
Part-Hawaiian, Hawaiian	35	19.0	54	27.0
Filipino	41	22.3	26	13.0
Caucasian (General)	19	10.3	25	12.5
Japanese	32	17.4	18	9.0
Portuguese	15	8.2	18	9.0
Puerto Rican	8	4.3	10	5.0
Chinese	7	3.8	5	2.5
Other	7	3.8	7	3.5
No Data	20	10.9	37	18.5

Table XIV-A

Comparison of School History of Sample Graduates and Dropouts

	Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%
Age-Grade Placement (Years Above or Below)				
3 or more years below	3	1.6	14	7.0
2 years below	5	2.7	37	18.5
1 year below	30	16.3	59	29.5
At grade level	144	78.3	90	45.0
1 or more years above	2	1.1	0	0
Attendance: Graduates Were Absent More Than 8 Per Cent of Total School Days, by Number* and Per Cent				
Grade Level				
1	83	45.1	77	38.5
2	66	35.9	73	36.5
3	46	25.0	57	28.5
4	44	23.9	52	26.0
5	32	17.4	52	26.0
6	34	18.5	50	25.0
7	31	16.8	53	26.5
8	45	24.5	74	37.0
9	53	28.8	91	45.5
10	68	37.0	91	45.5
11	86	46.7	52	26.0
12	78	42.4	22	11.0
No Data	54	29.3	13	6.5

Table XIV-A (cont'd)

	Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%
Failures: Grade Level at Which Students Were Retained by Number* and Per Cent				
Grade Level				
1	11	5.9	14	7.0
2	2	1.2	4	2.0
3	2	1.2	3	1.5
4	5	2.7	2	1.0
5	2	1.2	5	2.5
6	1	.6	5	2.5
7	3	1.6	1	.5
8	1	.6	7	3.5
9	1	.6	10	5.0
10	1	.6	20	10.0
11	--	----	11	5.5
12	--	----	3	1.5
None	145	78.8	96	48.0
No Data	10	5.4	17	8.5

---

*These numbers are non-additive. If an individual were absent more than 8 per cent of the time in three grades or were retained in three grades, all three were tallied.

Table XIV-A (cont'd)

	Graduates No.	Graduates %	Dropouts No.	Dropouts %
Number of Disciplinary Notations Found in Records, Secondary				
5 or More	3	1.6	79	39.5
3 to 4	9	4.9	12	6.0
1 to 2	23	12.5	26	13.0
None Found	149	81.0	67	33.5
No Data	0	0	16	8.0
Per Cent of Courses "Unsatisfactory" (D's & F's) at Last Report				
0%	15	8.2	22	11.0
10 - 19%	17	9.2	11	5.5
20 - 29%	13	7.0	6	3.0
30 - 39%	27	14.7	3	1.5
40 - 49%	20	10.9	8	4.0
50 - 59%	35	19.0	14	7.0
60 - 69%	23	12.5	9	4.5
70 - 79%	9	4.9	5	2.5
80 - 89%	15	8.2	8	4.0
90 - 99%	0	0	0	0
100%	10	5.4	73	36.5
No Data	0	0	41	20.5
Median		50.0		82.0

Table XIV-A (cont'd)

Academic Performance,* by School Level

	Elementary (Grade 1 - 6)				Intermediate (Grade 7 - 9)				High School (Grade 10 - 12)			
	Graduates		Dropouts		Graduates		Dropouts		Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Good or Better (Predominate A's, B's, +'s, or E's)	1	.6	2	1.0	0	0	2	1.0	0	0	1	.5
Satisfactory (Predominate C's, √'s, or S's)	115	62.5	80	40.0	104	56.5	41	20.5	88	47.8	7	3.5
Poor or Worse (Predominate D's, F's, -'s, or U's)	39	21.1	59	29.5	63	34.2	142	71.0	96	52.2	145	72.5
No Data	29	15.8	59	29.5	17	9.3	15	7.5	0	0	47	23.5

Character Trait Ratings, by School Level	Elementary (Grade 1 - 6)				Secondary (Grade 7 - 12)			
	Graduates		Dropouts		Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Above Average (Predominate 1's)	3	1.6	1	.5	0	0	0	0
Average (Predominate 2's)	109	59.2	85	42.5	161	87.5	55	27.5
Below Average (Predominate 3's)	45	24.5	61	30.5	12	6.5	112	56.0
No Data	27	14.7	53	26.5	11	6.0	33	16.5

*As long as 50 per cent or more of the total end-of-year grades were C or better, performance was rated as satisfactory.

Table XV-A

Comparison Between Graduates and Dropouts on Elementary School Standardized Test Scores

	CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Grade 3		Other Total Test IQ Scores		All Total Test IQ Scores			
	Graduates Number	Dropouts Number	Graduates Number	Dropouts Number	Graduates No.	Graduates %	Dropouts No.	Dropouts %
70 and below	8	5	2	0	10	5.4	5	2.5
71 - 75	13	9	2	1	15	8.2	10	5.0
76 - 80	13	20	3	2	16	8.7	22	11.0
81 - 85	16	11	0	2	16	8.7	13	6.5
86 - 90	16	18	4	5	20	10.8	23	11.5
91 - 95	24	13	1	5	25	13.6	18	9.0
96 - 100	16	20	3	2	19	10.3	22	11.0
101 - 105	17	13	0	3	17	9.2	16	8.0
106 - 110	12	10	0	1	12	6.5	11	5.5
111 - 115	7	4	2	3	9	4.9	7	3.5
116 and above	2	3	0	2	2	1.2	5	2.5
No Data					23	12.5	48	24.0

Median for Dropouts (based on the 152 known cases): 91
Median for Graduates (based on the 161 known cases): 92

Table XV-A (cont'd)

CAT Grade Placement, Grade 4

	Reading				Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)			
	Graduates		Dropouts		Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	9	4.9	4	2.0	7	3.8	2	1.0
2.1 - 2.9	52	28.3	36	18.0	31	16.8	25	12.5
3.0 - 4.1	56	30.4	48	24.0	67	36.4	65	32.5
4.2 and above	28	15.2	34	17.0	33	18.0	30	15.0
No Data	39	21.2	78	39.0	46	25.0	78	39.0
Median (based on known cases)	3.4		3.4		3.5		3.5	

Table XVI-A

Comparison Between Sample Graduates and Dropouts on Family Background

Educational Level of Parents

Highest Grade Completed by Father	Graduates No.	Graduates %	Dropouts No.	Dropouts %	Highest Grade Completed by Mother	Graduates No.	Graduates %	Dropouts No.	Dropouts %
0 - 2	10	5.4	1	.5	0 - 2	2	1.2	0	0
3 - 4	3	1.6	5	2.5	3 - 4	10	5.4	2	1.0
5 - 6	19	10.3	16	8.0	5 - 6	8	4.3	7	3.5
7 - 8	43	23.4	35	17.5	7 - 8	40	21.7	36	18.0
9 - 10	32	17.4	33	16.5	9 - 10	37	20.1	45	22.5
11 - 12	32	17.4	38	19.0	11 - 12	53	28.8	47	23.5
13 - 14	3	1.6	3	1.5	13 - 14	1	.6	7	3.5
15 - 16	15	8.2	6	3.0	15 - 16	3	1.6	2	1.0
No Data	27	14.7	63	31.5	No Data	30	16.3	54	27.0
Median for Graduates: 9					Median for Graduates: 10				
Median for Dropouts: 9					Median for Dropouts: 9				

Number of Siblings

	Graduates No.	Graduates %	Dropouts No.	Dropouts %
0	0	0	0	0
1	1	.6	6	3.0
2 - 3	50	27.2	36	18.0
4 - 7	92	49.9	92	46.0
8 or more	18	9.8	25	12.5
No Data	23	12.5	41	20.5
Median for Graduates: 5				
Median for Dropouts: 5				

Table XVI-A (cont'd)

Occupation of Father	Graduates		Dropouts	
	No.	%	No.	%
Professional - Managerial	3	1.6	3	1.5
Professional - Technical	2	1.2	12	6.0
Skilled	51	27.6	39	19.5
Clerical	7	3.8	4	2.0
Semi-skilled	46	25.0	30	15.0
Service	17	9.2	27	13.5
Sales	5	2.7	1	.5
Farmers	8	4.3	2	1.0
Unskilled	22	12.0	25	12.5
Unemployed	1	.6	9	4.5
No Data	22	12.0	51	25.5

THE CURRICULUM AND THE GRADUATE

Table XVII-A lists the courses pursued by the graduates and the number of course completions. Grade levels show when courses were pursued. A study of the courses completed by the graduates provides information regarding subject area and course concentration and the overall scope of the graduates' educational background and experiences.

Table XVII-A shows that the graduates completed more courses in language arts* than in any other subject area. Social Studies ranks second for both the graduates and the state total. Industrial arts ranks fourth for the graduates, but ninth for the state total. Agriculture and home economics rank substantially higher for the graduates than for the state total. The foreign language enrollment for the graduates is low, only .9 per cent compared to the 5.1 per cent for the state total. In the areas of science and mathematics the enrollments for the graduates claim lower precentages of 6.9 and 7.9, respectively, than statewide percentages of 9.2 for science and 10.9 for mathematics. In summary, the graduates are found to pursue proportionately more non-academic than academic courses.

Table XX-A lists the types of work pursued by the graduates within a year after graduation (it is recognized here that the type of work reported may be only temporary for each of the graduates). How relevant are the courses completed to the type of work pursued? For example, only two of the graduates found employment on the farm whereas 153 agriculture course completions were recorded for graduates. Further evaluation can be made of the courses pursued by the graduates and the employment opportunities available to them.

---

*Language Arts is required each year, 9-12.

Comparison of Curriculum for the Graduates and Dropouts

Comparison as shown in Table XIX-A is limited to the distribution of dropouts and graduates enrollments in the various subjects. Foreign language shows similar rank for both groups. It is the subject area with the smallest enrollment for both groups.

Between the graduates and the dropouts there is a difference of 5.3 per cent in health/physical education enrollment. The dropouts completed proportionately more HPE courses than other courses (with the exception of language arts). This accounts for the difference of 5.3 per cent between the two groups. In other non-academic subject areas the graduates show greater percent of the enrollment distribution. This perhaps points out that dropouts are unable or less inclined to take on elective courses in sufficient numbers and of sufficient interest to help keep them in school.

As compared to dropouts, the graduates are more adequately equipped with academic courses and electives though they terminate their formal education (temporarily or permanently) upon graduation and become fully employed. Both groups match in IQ and achievement levels but the graduates' records of courses completed and their persistence in school lend more promise of a brighter future for them.

Table XVII-A

Courses Pursued by 184 Sample Graduates "Fully Employed" within One Year After Graduation, by Grade Level (when courses were pursued) and Number

Courses	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Total
Agriculture					
Agricultural Arts	28	4	1	1	34
Floriculture			1	3	4
Horticulture 1 & 2	12	6	13	9	40
Horticulture 3 & 4			1		1
Vocational Agriculture 1 & 2		21	6	2	29
Vocational Agriculture 3 & 4			22	5	27
Vocational Agriculture 5 & 6				14	14
Practical Arts		1			1
Part-time Coop. Program				3	3
Total	40	32	44	37	153
Art					
Advertising Art 1 & 2	1		1	5	7
Basic Art 1 & 2	11	6	20	11	48
Basic Art 3 & 4			4	1	5
Basic Art 5 & 6				1	1
Design 1 & 2				1	1
Drawing & Painting 1 & 2		4	10	11	25
Drawing & Painting 3 & 4			2	2	4
Drawing & Painting 5 & 6			1	1	2
Graphic Arts 1 & 2	1				1
Graphic Arts 3 & 4				1	1
Crafts, Exploratory	4	1	1	3	9
Photography 1 & 2		1	1	2	4
Sculpture & Ceramics		1	2	7	10
Total	17	13	42	46	118
Business Education					
Bookkeeping 1 & 2		2	5	6	13
General Business	2	3	7	7	19
Business Machines			1	2	3
Business Math		7	11	8	26
Coop. Distributive Education				3	3
Economics, Applied				2	2
Office Practice*				2	2

---

*Whenever a course was listed only as "Office," it was tallied for "Office Training" under "Miscellaneous Courses."

Table XVII-A (cont'd)

Courses	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Total
Business Education (cont'd)					
Record Keeping		3	1	2	6
Salesmanship		1			1
Shorthand 1 & 2		1	5	6	12
Typing 1 & 2	31	50	17	14	112
Typing 3 & 4		5	16	7	28
Typing 5 & 6			2	3	5
Typing, Personal	4	2			6
Total	37	74	65	62	238
Home Economics					
Home Economics I	40	9	2	2	53
Home Economics II	2	16	4	4	26
Home Economics III			2	1	3
Family Clothing		2	1	10	13
Family Foods		10	20	17	47
Home Management		1	6		7
Home Nursing			3	2	5
Family Living			2	46	48
Personality & Dress		1	2	1	4
Total	42	39	42	83	206
Industrial Arts					
Automotive Mechanics 1 & 2		9	21	6	36
Automotive Mechanics 3 & 4			4	5	9
Automotive Mechanics 5 & 6				1	1
Drafting Architectural 1 & 2			1		1
Drawing, Engineering 1 & 2			1		1
Drawing, Mechanical 1 & 2		7	14	11	32
Drawing, Mechanical 3 & 4			1		1
Drawing, Mechanical 5 & 6				1	1
Electricity 1 & 2	1	5	4	4	14
Electricity 3 & 4			1		1
Electronics 1 & 2		2	1	1	4
Electronics 3 & 4			1	1	2
Electronics 5 & 6				1	1
Home Mechanics 1 & 2		4		1	5
Industrial Crafts 1 & 2	1	6	18	6	31
Industrial Crafts 3 & 4				2	2
Metals, General 1 & 2	7	21	12	8	48
Metals, General 3 & 4		1	3	5	9
Metals, General 5 & 6			1	2	3
Printing 1 & 2			3	4	7
Printing 3 & 4				1	1

Table XVII-A (cont'd)

Courses	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Total
Industrial Arts (cont'd)					
General Shop Gr. 8 or 9	32	4			36
Shop General 1 & 2	8	3	6		17
Shop General 3 & 4	3	1	7		11
Shop General 5 & 6				1	1
Woodwork 1 & 2	5	19	20	12	56
Woodwork 3 & 4			3	7	10
Woodwork 5 & 6				1	1
Power Mechanics			1	1	2
Part-Time Cooperative Voc. Prog.				3	3
Total	57	82	123	85	347
Language Arts					
Lang. Arts, Non-graded	1				1
Expository Writing			1	1	2
Newswriting 1 & 2	1			1	2
Newswriting 3 & 4			2		2
Developmental Reading 1 & 2	7	2	2	2	13
Reading Improvement	10	11	7	13	41
Reading Review				1	1
Remedial Reading	9	3			12
Literature & Grammar	4	4	4	4	16
English 1 & 2	172		1		173
English 3 & 4		171	6		177
English 5 & 6			157	8	165
English 7 & 8				169	169
Literature				1	1
Yearbook 1 & 2				4	4
Remedial English			1	1	2
English, Phase 1			2	3	5
English, Phase 2				1	1
English, Phase 5				2	2
Reading, Phase 5 (Castle)			1		1
Oral English*	17	10	12	12	51
Total	221	201	196	223	841
Speech					
Drama 1 & 2		3	2	6	11
Drama 3 & 4			2		2
Public Speaking			2		2
Speech Fundamentals	5	9	9	8	31

---

*Credit is not normally given for oral English but because it is applied towards the fulfillment of English 1 & 2 - 7 & 8, in exceptional cases, it is listed here for review.

Table XVII-A (cont'd)

Courses	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Total
Speech (cont'd)					
Speech Improvement	3	4	6	4	17
Speech, Phase 5 (Castle)			2		2
Total	8	16	23	18	65
Foreign Language					
French 1 & 2	1			1	2
German 1 & 2				1	1
Japanese 1 & 2	2		1	4	7
Japanese 3 & 4		1		2	3
Spanish 1 & 2	3	2	5	4	14
Spanish 3 & 4			2	1	3
Latin 1 & 2			4		4
Total	6	3	12	13	34
Mathematics					
Algebra 1 & 2	7	15	5	4	31
Algebra 3 & 4		1	4		5
Geometry, Plane & Solid		1	3	1	5
Math, Basic 1 & 2	34	19	4	7	64
Math, Basic 3 & 4	4	25	10	7	46
Math, Basic 5 & 6	3	3	6	3	15
Math, Basic 7 & 8		4		1	5
Math, General	13	19	11	4	47
Survey of Modern Math		1	1		2
Trig. & Analytic Geometry				1	1
Math, Gr. 9	100	6	2		108
Remedial Arithmetic	2				2
Total	163	94	46	28	331
Music					
Music Appreciation	4	1		1	6
Band, Beginning	7	5	4	2	18
Band, Intermediate	2	4	2		8
Band, Advance		4	3	1	8
Band, Senior				1	1
Choral, Beginning	8	10	29	17	64
Choral, Intermediate		4	6	6	16
Choral, Advance			5	15	20
Choral, Senior				2	2
Polynesian Inst. 1 & 2	3	1	4		8
Polynesian Inst. 3 & 4		1			1
Boy's Glee			1		1
Total	24	30	54	45	153

Table XVII-A (cont'd)

Courses	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Total
Physical Education					
PE 1 & 2 Girls	57	4			61
PE 3 & 4 Girls		45	1	1	47
PE 5 & 6 Girls		2	6	3	11
PE 7 & 8 Girls				5	5
PE 1 & 2 Boys	108	4			112
PE 3 & 4 Boys		101	6	1	108
PE 5 & 6 Boys		1	31	8	40
PE 7 & 8 Boys				13	13
Recreation Leadership			3	3	6
ROTC 1 & 2		22	1		23
ROTC 3 & 4			15	1	16
ROTC 5 & 6				1	1
Health & Safety Gr. 7-9	41				41
Health & Safety Gr. 10-12		45	3	3	51
Total	206	224	66	39	535
Science					
Biology I	5	68	15	11	99
Biology BSCS Special Mat'ls.			2	1	3
Biology II			2		2
Biology BSCS 1 & 2		1	2	1	4
Biology College Preparatory	1		1		2
Physiology				1	1
Zoology				1	1
Plants & Animals in Hawaii			1	7	8
Earth Science	1				1
Physical Science 1 & 2	37	16	8	4	65
General Science	83	4	2		89
Aerospace Science 1 & 2		1	1	4	6
Chemistry		1	3	2	6
Physics				2	2
Total	127	91	37	34	289
Social Studies					
American Problems				178	178
Social Studies, Gr. 9	175	1			176
Government of the U.S.	1				1
Hawaiiana			6	18	24
Psychology			3	10	13
Sociology				1	1
U.S. History			170	8	178
World Geography	1			1	2
World History		171	5	2	178

Table XVII-A (cont'd)

Courses	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Total
Social Studies (con'td.)					
World Culture	1				1
American Thought Practice		1	1		2
Religion I	2				2
Total	180	173	195	218	756
Miscellaneous					
Health Assistance			1	2	3
Library Training		5	3	9	17
Office Training	1	1	8	17	27
Guidance, Soph.		12	2		14
Guidance, Jr.			18		18
Guidance, Sr.				16	16
Audio Visual	1		1		2
Occup. Information				2	2
Study Skills	1				1
Humanities				1	1
Neighborhood Youth Corps			4	9	13*
School Service			2	5	7
Cafeteria Training		1	1		2
Driver Education		2	1	1	4
Teacher Assistant	1		4	5	10
Clerk Aide			1	2	3
Counselor Aide				3	3
Total	4	21	46	72	143

---

*Two credit were allowed pupils who participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Table XVIII-A

Comparison between Sample Graduates and State Total: Distribution of Enrollment in Various Subject Areas

	No. of Courses Completions by Graduates	Per Cent of Total Enrollment	Rank Order	1966-67 State Total Enrollment in Subject Areas	Per Cent of Total Subject Enrollment	Rank Order
Language Arts	841	16.7	1	48,283	18.1	1
Health and PE	535	11.1	3	26,147	9.8	4
Social Studies	756	18.9	2	44,929	16.9	2
Mathematics	331	8.3	5	29,014	10.9	3
Science	289	7.2	6	24,445	9.2	5
Industrial Arts	347	8.6	4	13,374	5.0	9
Business Education	238	6.0	7	18,596	7.0	7
Home Economics	206	5.2	8	6,562	2.4	11
Miscellaneous	143	3.6	11	19,991	7.5	6
Music	153	3.8	9	7,161	2.7	10
Speech	65	2.9	13	5,985	2.2	12
Agriculture	153	3.8	10	3,095	1.2	14
Art	118	3.0	12	5,400	2.0	13
Foreign Language	34	.9	14	13,525	5.1	8
Total	4,209	100.0		266,507	100.0	

Table XIX-A

Comparison between Sample Graduates and Dropouts: Distribution of Enrollment in Various Subject Areas

	No. of Courses Completions by Dropouts*	Per Cent of Total Enrollment	Rank Order	No. of Course Completions by Graduates	Per Cent of Total Enrollment	Rank Order
Language Arts	321	18.8	1	841	16.7	1
Health and PE	306	18.0	2	535	11.1	3
Social Studies	280	16.5	3	756	18.9	2
Mathematics	171	10.0	4	331	8.3	5
Science	140	8.3	5	289	7.2	6
Industrial Arts	116	6.8	6	347	8.6	4
Business Education	92	5.4	7	238	6.0	7
Home Economics	54	3.2	8	206	5.2	8
Miscellaneous	51	3.0	9	143	3.6	11
Music	48	2.8	10	153	3.8	9
Speech	38	2.2	11	116	2.9	13
Agriculture	37	2.2	12	153	3.8	10
Art	32	1.8	13	118	3.0	12
Foreign Language	17	1.0	14	34	.9	14
Total	1703	100.0		4209	100.0	

*In a number of instances dropouts completed only one semester of a full-year course prior to dropping out.

Table XX-A

Type of Work Reported for Graduates "Fully Employed" within One Year After Graduation

	Number
Babysitter	1
Baker	1
Beautician	1
Busboys & girls	3
Cafeteria worker	2
Cannery worker	1
Cashier	2
Clerk	4
Cook	4
Counter	4
Custodian	1
Delivery man	3
Desk clerk	1
Dishwasher	3
Driver: truck, bus or taxi, tour guide	2
Factory worker	3
Farmer	2
Hotel worker	4
Laborer, construction, etc.	$\boxed{18}$
Librarian (aide)	1
Machinist helper or apprentice	1
Mechanic helper or apprentice	3
Nurse, practical or aide	1
Peace Corps., Vista, NYC	1
Plantation laborer	1
Policeman	1
Produce clerk	2
Rancher, cowboy	1
Receptionist	2
Repairman: appliances	1
Salesman, salesgirl	7
Secretary or stenographer	2
Service station attendant	$\boxed{17}$
Stewardess, steward	1
Stock boy	$\boxed{8}$
Telephone operator	2
Usher or usherette	2
Waiter or waitress	$\boxed{13}$
Warehouseman	2
Welder or sheet metal worker, helper or apprentice	3
Yardman	1
Don't know	31
Other	20

SUMMARY

It is the intent and goal of public school systems to provide free and equal education for all able youths. The enactment of legislation in Hawaii, increasing the compulsory school age limit from 16 to 18, is indicative of such effort to provide youngsters with as much schooling as possible, especially, for those who can not or do not seek education beyond high school. A variety of efforts are in evidence which are designed to keep youngsters in school, to keep the dropout rate at a minimum.

A study of dropouts, their academic and personal problems, should generate a kind of understanding and empathy on the part of educators and others interested in the welfare of the youth. To the dropout, school-and-family life appears bleak and hopeless. Grade slips are poor (predominately D's and F's), if not completely failing, from year to year. Relationships with peers and teachers are not favorable. Opportunities for succeeding and achieving within one's own academic and social limitations are rare or appear to be impossible. Absence from school and escape from daily problems appear to be the easier way out.

The identification and follow-up of potential dropouts (long absent from school) can help to bring the student back to school but what can be done anew at the school to revitalize and sustain his interest in school?

Failure in course work and retention at grade levels are critical problems for potential dropouts. These students are not promising learners and as such have small appeal for many faculty members. The publication by the University of the State of New York, How High Schools Can Reduce Their Dropout Rate, lists a few time-worn considerations associated with school failures:

1. That a pupil failed because "he didn't try hard enough." Only rarely are there not other more pertinent reasons and these should be discovered. The staff member assigning the failing grade is in an excellent position to do this.

2. That a "repeater" needs less help the second time he attempts a program because "he's had it all before." If anything, he needs more help, and encouragement.

3. That it is enough for a staff member, often the counselor, to "see" all the failures at the end of each marking period and admonish them to "do better." At the very least, when the same crop of failing pupils is yielded again and again, a more profound approach is required.

4. That failure is a problem of individual pupils and requires individual reaction. As it is observed that certain difficulties are shared by a number of students, it is possible that economy of professional time and effort may be best served by establishing remedial instruction or even new instructional levels and techniques for groups of pupils.

The graduates who fall in categories (low IQ, poor achievement, etc.) similar to those of the dropouts do persist in school. What helps to keep this group from dropping out? The study of graduates as reported here reveals significant differences between the two groups. Do these differences account for one group persisting and another dropping off on the wayside? If this is so, it may well be that further efforts toward the prevention of dropouts should lean heavily on: 1) coping with problems related to and resulting from students' character trait weaknesses, 2) reliance upon curriculum adjustment rather than retentions throughout grades eight to twelve, 3) provision for educational experiences and objectives which can be challenging as well as attainable, and 4) complementary grading and evaluation techniques that provide for the measurement of achievement in terms of individual ability and effort, thereby minimizing failure and discouragement.

A reliable profile of dropout characteristics, proven to be consistent for the two most recent groups of Hawaii dropouts, is presented here in summary. This profile provides supporting data for the identification and prediction of potential dropouts. It can also eventually provide a basis for computerized data on dropouts. The value of mechanically processed data is found in expediting the identification, prediction, and follow-up contact with students long absent from school for unknown reasons. The final and major responsibility for the prevention and recovery of dropouts, however, still rests, and will continue to do so, on school personnel. It is this contention that prompts a new proposal to make possible the early identification of potential dropouts.

This proposal suggests procedures supplementary to presently existing procedures to identify, predict, and follow-up potential dropouts and actual dropouts. These supplementary procedures are especially geared toward directing specific follow-up of potential dropouts at the school level. Problems of potential dropouts are pinpointed so that provision for assistance to identified students must be directed towards alleviating specified problems. New and existing school programs must be aimed towards helping these potential dropouts with specific problems. The return of students to school will be useless unless programs are planned in terms of their specific problems. In addition, these supplementary procedures provide for finer screening of students than now possible through the single criterion of absence. (See the attached proposal.)

For the conclusion of the various phases of this study on dropouts, provision is made here for summary comparisons between: 1) 1965-66 and 1966-67 dropouts and 2) dropouts and graduates.

It was one of the purposes of the 1968 study to determine the degree of consistency of local statistics on dropouts. According to Table XXII-A all categories of characteristics show definite consistency in the findings. (Not included for comparison are two categories that were technically reorganized for more detailed coverage and therefore not totally subject to ready comparison. These are 1) number of siblings and 2) absence of 8.0 per cent of total school days per year.)

The categories of characteristics that show the greatest differences between the graduate and dropout groups are summarized below. Though the most frequently cited reason for dropping out is annually recorded as "non-attendance," the study concluded here shows no marked difference in attendance patterns between the dropouts and the graduates. Instead character trait ratings, academic performance, and failure (retention at grades 8-12) should be the areas of major attention and concern according to the findings of this report. The following Table XXI-A lists the most significant statistical differences between the graduate and dropout groups.

The follow-up of dropouts, within the area defined, shows evidence of benefits derived from such intermediary agencies (serving as a bridge between the school and the "adult world") as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps. Dropouts were found to have "persisted" in these programs long enough, in many of the cases, to benefit from the programs offered.

A follow-up of the dropouts (including those receiving public welfare assistance), as covered by this study, clearly indicates the need for a full-scale follow-up of all dropouts for early contact with them. With out-of-school guidance and direction, early return to high school or referrals and placements in job training centers, apprenticeship programs, or youth employment becomes possible.

A study of curriculum problems related to dropouts points out the urgency for alternative ways to cope with the educational needs of learners. Increasingly emerging are a wide range of preventive and remedial activities sponsored by government and community agencies and schools at local and national levels. This report (in the section on "The Curriculum and the Dropout" and in Appendix C and D) lists research studies alerting educators of the dropout's curriculum needs. Careful planning, coordination, and evaluation of such programs should effectively provide quality public education for youngsters of Hawaii.

Table XXI-A

Statistical Summary of Comparison Between Graduates and Dropouts

Category of Characteristics	Per Cent of Graduates	Per Cent of Dropouts	Per Cent of Difference
Character trait ratings, secondary: "average"	87.5	27.5	60.0
Number of disciplinary notations: "none found"	81.0	33.5	47.5
Failures-retentions at grade levels: "none"	78.8	33.6	45.2
Retentions at Gr. 8-12	1.8	25.5	23.7
Academic perfomance, high school: "satisfactory"	47.7	3.5	44.3
Age-grade placement: "at grade level"	78.3	45.0	33.3
Median per cent with "unsatisfactory" last report	50.0	82.0	32.0

Table XXII-A

Summary of Comparison between 1965-66 and 1966-67 Dropouts

	1965-66 %	1966-67 %
Sex Distribution		
Male	61.6	64.0
Female	38.4	36.0
Grade at Time of Exit		
Gr. 9	12.0	10.5
10	32.0	37.5
11	34.3	34.5
12	21.5	17.5
School Area Where Dropped		
Honolulu	52.9	56.5
Rural Oahu	34.9	31.5
Neighbor Island	12.2	12.0
Religious Preference		
Catholic	26.7	14.0
Protestant	19.8	17.5
Buddhist	2.9	2.0
No Preference Indicated/No Data	50.6	66.5
Ethnic Group of Natural Father		
Part Hawaiian/Hawaiian	21.5	27.0
Filipino	20.9	13.0
Caucasian	9.9	12.5
Japanese	8.1	9.0
Puerto Rican	6.4	5.0
Portuguese	2.9	9.0
Chinese	2.3	2.5
Other	6.4	3.5
No Data	21.5	18.5

Table XXII-A (cont'd)

	1965-66 %	1966-67 %
Age at Time of Exit		
14	.6	2.0
15	9.3	14.5
16	32.0	27.5
17	34.3	34.0
18	16.7	12.5
19	5.2	8.0
20	1.2	1.0
21	.6	----
22	----	.5
Age-Grade Placement		
3 or more years below	5.8	7.0
2 years below	17.4	18.5
1 year below	30.2	29.5
At grade level	46.5	45.0
1 or more years above	0	0
Month of Exit		
September	4.1	2.5
October	12.8	6.0
November	11.6	15.5
December	5.8	7.5
January	14.5	13.5
Total: 1st Semester	48.8	45.0
February	14.5	12.5
March	18.6	21.0
April	9.3	15.0
May	7.0	5.0
June	1.7	1.5
Total: 2nd Semester	51.1	55.0
Attendance - Per Cent Absent During Year of Exit (per cent based on no. of days enrolled prior to dropping out)		
86% or more	15.1	3.5
56 - 85%	12.8	13.5
46 - 55%	9.3	9.5
16 - 45%	35.5	35.0
15% or less	11.7	8.5
No Data	15.7	30.0

Table XXII-A (cont'd)

	1965-66 %	1966-67 %
Per Cent Courses Failed at Last Report*		
0%	7.6	11.0
10 - 49%	15.7	14.0
50 - 89%	19.2	18.0
90 - 100%	40.1	36.5
No Data	17.4	20.5
Physical Handicaps Noted		
None Recorded	94.2	91.0
Recorded	5.8	9.0
CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Gr. 3	Median	
Median	91	91
CAT Grade Placement, Gr. 4		
Median, Reading	3.4	3.4
Median, Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language	3.5	3.5
Failures: Retentions at Grade Levels		
Gr. 1	7.3	7.0
2	2.6	2.0
3	3.6	1.5
4	1.6	1.0
5	1.0	2.5
6	1.6	2.5
7	2.1	.5
8	3.6	3.5
9	6.7	5.0
10	20.7	10.0
11	10.9	5.5
12	3.1	1.5
None	35.2	48.0
Academic Performance, High School		
Good or Better	.6	.5
Satisfactory	6.4	3.5
Poor or Worse	76.7	72.5
No Data	16.3	23.5

---

*For 1965-66 percentages, "no. of courses" were converted to percentages on the basis of 4-5 average number of courses pursued by each dropout.

Table XXII-A (cont'd)

	1965-66 %	1966-67 %
Character Trait Ratings, Secondary		
Above Average	.6	----
Average	4.1	27.5
Below Average	86.0	56.0
No Data	9.3	16.5
Number of Disciplinary Notations, Secondary		
5 or more	41.3	39.5
3 to 4	9.3	6.0
1 to 2	5.2	13.0
None Found	44.2	41.5
Family Background	Median	
Highest Grade Completed by Father	10*	9
Highest Grade Completed by Mother	10*	9
Individual Living with		
Both Natural Parents	50.6	56.5
Mother Only	10.5	9.0
Father Only	2.9	3.0
Mother-Stepfather	14.5	8.0
Father-Stepmother	1.7	1.5
Grandparents	2.9	2.0
Foster Parents	4.1	1.0
Relative	8.7	6.5
Friend	1.2	1.0
No Data	2.9	11.5
Years of Residence in School District Where Dropped		
1 or less	15.7	22.0
2 - 3	18.6	10.5
4 - 5	7.0	7.0
6 - 7	3.5	5.5
8 or more	51.2	41.0
No Data	4.1	14.0

---

*The 1965-66 medians were computed on the basis of intervals longer than those of the 1966-67 set of intervals. This may account for the difference of one grade level between the medians of the two years.

Table XXII-A (cont'd)

	1965-66 %	1966-67 %
No. of Schools Attended Outside of Feeder Unit Complex	Median 1	 1
Socio-Economic Status		
Below Average*	46.5	64.0
Average	34.3	14.0
Above Average	9.9	4.5
No Data	9.3	17.5
Educational Level of Parents		
Father	9	10
Mother	9	9
Occupation of Father		
Professional - Managerial	5.8	1.5
Professional - Technical	4.1	6.0
Skilled	14.5	19.5
Clerical	2.9	2.0
Semi-Skilled	20.3	15.0
Service	14.0	13.5
Sales	3.5	.5
Farmers	1.2	1.0
Unskilled	12.8	12.5
Unemployed	10.5	4.5
No Data	10.5	25.5

---

*With the cooperation from the Department of Social Services, 17.5 per cent of the 1966-67 dropouts were identified as public welfare recipients.

TABLE XXIII-A

SUMMARY PROFILE OF HAWAII PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

The following characteristics are commonly found among youths who are potential or actual dropouts.

School

1. Poor attendance: Absence of 8.0 per cent or more of total school days in the year (occurring most frequently in grades 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 11)
2. Failure of one or more school years (grades 1, 8, 9, 10, and 11 most commonly failed)
3. Frequency of change of schools: range from none to more than 4
4. Behavior problems as evidenced by recurring referrals (teacher reported anecdotes and notations or counseling and psychological referrals)
5. Below-average character trait ratings (predominately 3's on a 3-point scale)
6. Academic performance frequently rated poor (predominately D's, F's, -'s, or U's)
7. IQ scores occurring most frequently between below -70 to 102 (median of 91)
8. Grades 10 and 11 show greatest dropout frequency
9. Ages 16 and 17 show greatest dropout frequency
10. Boys' dropout rate doubles that of girls

Family

1. Large families: 4 to 7 siblings
2. Below average socio-economic status
3. Parents' educational background: median of grade 9
4. Father's occupation: predominately skilled, semi-skilled, service work,

Table XXIII-A (cont'd)

unskilled, and unemployed

5. Ethnic origin in order of descending frequency: part, Hawaiian/Hawaiian, Filipino, General Caucasian, Japanese, Portuguese, Puerto Rican, and Chinese

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

A PROPOSED SET OF PROCEDURES FOR THE EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS

PREFACE

The proposed set of procedures for the early identification of potential dropouts was prepared for general use at any grade level (elementary-secondary) but with particular appropriateness for grades 9-12 (procedures were based on data concerning characteristics of dropouts recorded as of grade 9, 10, 11, or 12). A test run was conducted to establish the overall practicality of the proposed instrument and to establish guidelines appropriate for those grade levels below high school. Results of the test run are presented here as Part II.

FOREWORD

The experience of two years of effort in collecting, analyzing, and reporting data descriptive of secondary students in the public schools of Hawaii has brought into clearer and sharper relief the plight of the student who chooses to drop out of school rather than complete the requirements for graduation from high school. In former years the student dropout was treated simply as a reported statistic, generally without formal identification, and with little if any regard for his personal plight, which was held to be a social problem that one must expect and accept. It was reasoned that, after all, in any given school a certain number of students are bound to leave school -- the pattern of the past clearly predicts this as a natural social phenomenon. Faced with this statistical fact of life, the dropout must accept his destiny and learn to live with it -- after all it was his choice.

But was it -- completely?

The direct involvement of the federal government in public education and its particular interest in student dropouts does more than suggest that the dropout represents a greater problem to society than he does to himself, and that society, in its failure to recognize its obligation to provide alternatives for the potential dropout, shares in the decision when he decides to leave school. At the very least it concurs passively with this decision; at the worst it provides an impetus to forcing him out.

In any case he is still very much the responsibility of society, whether in school or not, and probably will continue to be throughout much, if not all, of his adult life.

It is the reality of the dropout's decision to leave school and the possible lifetime cost to society of this decision that makes imperative that the potential dropout be identified at the earliest possible point in his life and that substantial study and effort be given to the correction of those conditions which are determined to be major contributing factors underlying his decision to leave school.

Mrs. Janet Sumida, a researcher with the Office of Research, after making a thorough study of the characteristics of dropouts has identified certain distinguishing traits which set the potential dropout apart from his peers, and she advances the belief that when these traits are ascertained in students at an early age and in the lower elementary grades, steps can be taken to prevent a given student who is identified as a potential dropout from leaving school.

INTRODUCTION

The proposed procedures for the early identification of and follow through with potential school dropouts, grew out of a study which had as one of its major purposes careful scrutiny of those characteristics of dropouts which are distinguishably different from those students who persevere through twelve years of school and graduate from high school. To sharpen these differences, individual high school graduates were selected from among all graduates because their general characteristics and school records evidenced a marked similarity to those of students who had left school.

These sample graduates were selected from among those in the lowest quintile group who had joined the labor force rather than continue their education beyond high school graduation. When these graduates were compared with the dropouts, characteristics which were commonly held as well as those which were distinctly different became vividly apparent. All members of both groups scored low (dropouts' IQ median: 91; graduates' IQ median: 92) on the California Mental Maturity Test given in the third grade; scored below the mean on the standardized achievement test given in the fourth grade, had a record of poor attendance; had a natural father of same or similar ethnic background; had parents of similar educational level; and came from families with approximately the same number of siblings. Proportionately, both groups had about the same number of males and females.

Certain differences existing between the two groups became apparent when the school records of dropouts were closely examined. Personal records of dropouts revealed that as individuals they were judged to have poor or unsatisfactory character traits; that they had frequent discipline problems; that they had failed to pass one or more times between grades 8 to 12 (resulting in overage in grade placement); and that their academic performance was regarded as generally poor.

With these differences identified, it should be possible to apply them as factors which can reasonably predict the potential dropout while there is still time to alter the pattern which threatens to lead to his leaving school. Just how that pattern may be altered does not lie within the scope of this proposal for this concerns an area of highly specialized knowledge and training and should not be dealt with in any routine or arbitrary fashion.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCEDURES IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS

Because the establishment of a fully functional pupil accounting system is still some years in the future; and because the social problem of dropouts continues to increase in significance and concern within the larger context of the Hawaii State Government as well as the State Department of Education, some method, some set of procedures should be instituted now which can provide the data required in administering to the problem, and which can be converted to machine processing with a minimum effort at some time in the future. To meet these two conditions, the following set of procedures are proposed for early adoption by the administration of the Department.

General Procedures for Phase I-II-III

1. A standard checklist (to be designated as Form 419-B, a supplement to the presently existing Form 419 and 419-A) can be used for elementary through high school grade levels. The factors listed are the categories of characteristics established as different for dropouts and graduates. Scale values of one to four for each factor show tendencies to drop out from "least likely" to "most likely." Total scores can range from zero to 20 points. The checklist can be presented on a single page or on an "IBM" card.

2. Continuing with the absence criterion set by the Special Project to Identify and Report Potential High School Dropouts (initiated in February 1968), absence of 8.0 per cent (14 days) or more is newly designated as a guide for the initial screening and identification of students as potential dropouts.

3. Upon initial identification (according to the criterion for absence), further screening is based on scale values assigned to the categories of characteristics for each student. The following table provides a cut-off point differentiating between positive ratings for persisters and negative ratings for potential dropouts.

Checklist for Identification of Potential School Dropouts, Form 419-B.

No. of Days Absent[a] to Date ________ Date ____________________

District Sch Code Sex Gr. Age Last name First Middle I.D. No.

Below are listed potential factors in early school leaving and persistence in school. Negative and positive characteristics are indicated by scale value. Check only one block for each factor.

FACTOR

			Per Cent Poor		
A. Unsatisfactory or poor character traits[b]	0	up to 25	26-50	51-75	76-100
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scale Value	0	1	2	3	4

B. Number of disciplinary notations[c]	0	1	2	3	4 or More
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scale Value	0	1	2	3	4

			No. of Retentions (gr. 8-12)		
C. Retention at grade level	None	K-7	1	2	3 or More
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scale Value	0	1	2	3	4

D. Age-grade placement	above-even	-1	-2	-3	-4 or More
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scale Value	0	1	2	3	4

			Per Cent D's and F's		
E. Academic performance (D's and F's)[d]	None	up to 25	26-50	51-75	76-100
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scale Value	0	1	2	3	4

TOTAL SCORE________

[a] Report pupils who have been absent for 14 days or more this school year.

[b] Traits include personal and social attitudes, health and safety attitudes, work habits, industry, initiative, concern for others, leadership, and responsibility. "Poor" is based on a preponderance of 3's, -'s, or D's and F's.

[c] Notations can include records of expulsion, suspension, warnings, anecdotes, etc.

[d] Grades assigned at end of the quarter, semester, or year.

Prediction Points Based on Scaled Ratings
For Students Who Persevere and Potential Dropouts

FACTOR	Positive Scaled Ratings for Persisters			Negative Scaled Rating for Potential Dropouts	
A. Unsatisfactory or poor character traits	0%	up to 25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Scale Value	⓪	①	②	③	④
B. No. of disciplinary notations	0			1, 2, 3, 4 or More	
Scale Value	⓪			① ② ③ ④	
				No. of Retentions (Gr. 8-12)	
C. Retention at grade level	None,	K-7		1, 2, 3 or More	
Scale Value	⓪	①		② ③ ④	
				Below	
D. Age-grade placement	Above - even			-1 -2 -3 -4 or More	
Scale Value	⓪			① ② ③ ④	
E. Academic performance, D's and F's	None	up to 25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Scale Value	⓪	①	②	③	④
Maximum Scores	5			20	

The maximum points that still permit a rating of "positive" would be 5 points. For example:

Factor	Rating	Scale Value or Score
A. Unsatisfactory or poor character traits	26-50%	2
B. No. of disciplinary notations	0	0
C. Retention at grade level	K-7	1
D. Age-grade placement	above-even	0
E. Academic performance	26-50%	2
	Total	5 Points

Any score beyond 5 points would be rated as "negative." Those whose ratings total 20 points would be considered most likely to drop out and, conversely, zero points would mean most likely not to drop out. The probability of dropping out will decrease proportionately with decreasing scale values or scores.

Screening (by scale values) for follow-up purposes can be processed methodically. Total rating scores can help determine priority, if necessary, of individual or group cases to be examined. Individual factor scale values can be the basis for combining students for group counseling or other activities. Instructional program planning and evaluation can be initiated through a study of the problem areas that present themselves as checklists are processed and data compiled.

4. Follow-up of Potential Dropouts:

a. All students initially identified on the criterion of absence alone, regardless of rating, will be contacted for appropriate follow-up for: return to school, modification of individual instructional program, vocational training, employment placement, etc., following procedures to process Form 419-A.

b. Screening for full or part-time employment, return to school, job training, etc., will depend on combinations of negative and positive categories.

c. Planning for appropriate follow-up school programs for individuals will depend upon the severity of problems as indicated by the individual scores for the various factors. Each factor requires special consideration and planning. For example, five points for age-grade placement means that the student may need to be specially placed in grade level subjects and other school activities. Any administrator on reviewing the rating sheet should be able to detect the youngster's problem (relating prolonged absence to overage) and investigate further the other factors involved.

d. Progress Report: The following Follow-up Form 419-C will assist the administrator to quickly summarize and follow-up whatever appropriate measures have been taken to cope with the youngster's specific problems. For specificity and clarity each factor rated "negative" should be pursued individually and summarized one factor per sheet.

Procedures By Phase I-II-III

The following proposed chart, Procedures by Phase, lists briefly checklist and follow-up requirements for each phase: source of information. personnel, materials, and time due.

Phase I. Without facilities or funding for computerization, the identification and follow-up of potential dropouts can still be implemented immediately through "paper-and-pencil" procedures for screening and identification. "Paper-and-pencil" means a manual and non-computerized operation.

Phase II. Continue present provision of computerized printouts listing students with consecutive or cumulative absence of 20 days or more. The new proposal is to provide additional computerized data (factors indicating dropping out or persistance in school) for each individual. With proposed screening procedures that can accomodate processing of more students, the base of 20 days can be adjusted to 14 days. The checklist will be key-punched for data processing. The proposed comprehensive printout will present total scaled values for each student to distinguish between positively and negatively rated students. A proposed printout layout is presented to compare with the present 1967-68 format. See Appendix A-B.

Phase III. With a total pupil accounting system projected for 1972, the identification of potential dropouts can eventually be continued as a totally computerized operation. Taped information on school history and family background can quickly produce periodic reports identifying potential dropouts. Checklist information need not wait for the here-and-now, "paper-and-pencil" screening of students (by attendance reports) but can be initiated and supplied by computer technology whenever data on selected factors are needed. Convenient combinations of selected factors can be readily assembled for interpretation.

Procedures by Phase:	I Paper-and-Pencil Processing	II Interim Computerized Processing	III Statewide Pupil Accounting System
Checklist, Form 419-B			
Source of information	Cumulative folders, Form 12-13	→	→
	Attendance records	→	→
Personnel	Clerk under supervision of professional staff member (to process checklists)		→
		Data processing staff	→
Materials	One-page checklist, Form 419-B	Data processing checklist card, Form 419-B	→
		Computerized printouts, including data from Form 419-A	→
			Tape reservoir for pupil accounting system
Time due	Bi-weekly	Weekly	Weekly
Follow-up			
Source of information	Teacher, counselor, administrator	→	
Personnel	Clerk under supervision of professional staff member	→	
	Professional staff at school level	→	
	Resource help from district and state levels and community agencies		→
Materials	One-page progress report	→	→
Time due	End of quarter or semester	→	→

FOLLOW-UP OF POTENTIAL DROPOUT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

Form 419-C

Date________________________

Student____
Last First Middle

A follow-up of factor: A B C D E (circle one factor only)

1. Provision for possible alternatives in terms of curriculum adaptation or special programs:

   a.

   b.

   c.

2. Actual steps taken for one or more above alternatives:

   Alternative a.

   b.

   c.

3. Proposal for further action on one or more above alternatives:

   Alternative a.

   b.

   c.

____
Signature of Administrator

____
Date

FORM 419-A

COMPUTER CENTER
NUMBER THREE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PUPIL PERSONNEL ACTION

WEEK ENDING______________

DIST. SCH CODE SCHOOL

					INITIAL				COMPLETED		
ID NO.	NAME ADDRESS	GRADE	SEX	BIRTHDATE	DATE OF ACTION	ACTION	OTHER INFO	HOME PHONE	DATE OF ACTION	ACTION	REASONS FOR ABSENCES

FORM 419-B

CHECKLIST FOR IDENTIFICATION AND PREDICTION OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS 1968-69

DISTRICT SCH CODE SCHOOL

DATE______________________

ID NO.	SEX	AGE	GR	LAST NAME, FIRST MIDDLE	UNSATISFACTORY CHARACTER TRAITS	NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY NOTATIONS	RETENTION AT GRADE LEVEL	AGE-GRADE PLACEMENT	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	TOTAL SCALE VALUES	NO. OF DAYS ABSENT

In Conclusion

There is no magic in this set of procedures. The usefulness of all procedures can only be measured by the personal effectiveness of those persons who are held responsible in carrying them out.

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL PROJECT TO IDENTIFY AND REPORT POTENTIAL HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

SPECIAL PROJECT TO IDENTIFY, REPORT, AND ASSIST POTENTIAL HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Problem

During the past 5 years, Hawaii's public schools have been required to submit a "Pupil Reporting Form" (Form 419) as a record of completed action following the separation of students from school. Data from these records have been compiled, analyzed, and findings referred to the schools, districts and organizations concerned.

Some public and private sectors of the community, however, have indicated to the Department of Education the need to identify and report potential dropouts, to enable preventive measures to be taken before they actually drop out of school. There are many students not listed on dropout reports who are chronic absentees, academic failures and discipline problems. They, in reality, are dropouts.

Project Proposal

Lt. Governor Thomas P. Gill initiated last October a series of meetings of all departments and agencies concerned with the youth of the State. Out of these sessions has evolved a plan to speed up the school dropout identification and reporting system in a total state manpower program. The plan, designed to help the dropout adjust to society as well as to help him hold a job, calls for the initial identification of these youngsters by the DOE with follow through assistance from various agencies of the community.

Identification Criteria

The DOE, in identifying and reporting potential dropouts, supplied the Department of Labor with weekly computer-printed lists containing the following information: Names, addresses, telephone numbers, ages and other pertinent data. (See Attachment A) The Labor Department coordinated agency services to locate and help the students.

For this project, a potential dropout was identified as a student who is:

1. Credited with 20 days of absenteeism (unexcused or unexplained, consecutive or non-consecutive) within 1 school year, and

2. Suspended from school, pending dismissal or awaiting approval of action by the district superintendent.

To expedite the project and to avoid involved discussions on the merits and demerits of subjective criteria, such as academic failure, misbehavior, disinterest in school, etc., "attendance" was selected as the objective criterion for the purpose of identifying the potential dropout. There was unanimity that extended unexcused or unexplained absences would be a suitable indicator.

Reporting Procedures

The following operational procedures were developed:

1. Schools identify and submit to the DOE's Special Services Branch on "Supplementary Pupil Action Report Form" (Form 419-A) names of students as criteria were met.
2. Data collated and transmitted to the Data Processing Office every Friday for key punching, sorting and computer listing.
3. Dropout listings for follow-up action provided to the Department of Labor, Outreach Aides and schools every Monday morning.
4. Follow-up actions continuously reported by the Department of Labor to the DOE for updating of its weekly potential dropout lists.
5. Current lists prepared weekly except during the Spring Vacation.

Program Description

Five Oahu high schools - Waianae, Aiea, Farrington, Kaimuki and Kailua - were selected to participate in the program which was in operation for 4 months - February 1 to May 31, 1968. In addition to the fact these schools serve communities with many disadvantaged families, there is a Community Action Program in each area.

Administratively, each school was responsible to its district superintendent; technical supervision was provided by the Special Services Branch of the DOE.

The Community Action Programs in the five areas hired 10 outreach workers or dropout prevention aides, many of whom formerly were dropouts. Two were assigned to each school to assist the school counselors in reaching some of the difficult-to-contact students and their parents.

These workers made the initial contacts, interpreted school policies, got their viewpoints and expressions of problems and needs, encouraged the students to return to school by helping them resolve their difficulties, and reported their findings back to the schools.

The outreach workers provided transportation to and from school for the students and their parents for conferences with school officials.

Additionally, the Employment Service Counselors, as needed, were brought into the situation for additional counseling of these students.

The Community College System provided the training for the outreach aides and general supervision of their operations in the field.

The State Commission on Manpower and Full Employment was given the responsibility for overall coordination of the project. Once a month, participating agency representatives joined the aides at their training sessions to review progress and to develop approaches to problems and needs which had arisen.

Under this new, creative approach the efforts of the school, the Community Action Program, Employment Service, Community College System, and the State Manpower and Full Employment Commission were brought together in a total effort to help the potential dropout and his family arrive at a solution. All this took place while the student was still enrolled in school.

Should it prove wiser for the students to drop out of school, the aides referred them to the Employment Service for testing, counseling, and proper placement in such projects as the Manpower Development and Training Program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps or other Federal and State agencies.

This was the first concerted effort to bring together all major Federal and State agencies involved in manpower development to assist the dropout. Where often it was too late because the student already had quit school, this pilot program was aimed at providing help before this happened. A major burden lay with the school in providing the resources, curricula and instruction to motivate the youngsters to complete their schooling.

Unfortunately, there was no program designed to benefit dropouts below the age of 16.

APPENDIX C

DETAILED DATA (BY SCHOOL AREAS) ON SAMPLE GRADUATES

Table XXIV-A

General Characteristics of Sample Graduates

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	50	100.0	70	100.0	64	100.0	184	100.0
Male	36	72.0	48	68.6	41	64.1	125	67.9
Female	14	28.0	22	31.4	23	35.9	59	32.1
Ethnic Group of Natural Father								
Part-Hawaiian, Hawaiian	4	8.0	10	14.3	21	32.8	35	19.0
Filipino	8	16.0	15	21.4	18	28.1	41	22.3
Caucasian	5	10.0	12	17.1	2	3.1	19	10.3
Japanese	13	26.0	12	17.1	7	10.9	32	17.4
Portuguese	2	4.0	7	10.0	6	9.4	15	8.2
Puerto-Rican	2	4.0	2	2.9	4	6.3	8	4.3
Chinese	4	8.0	1	1.5	2	3.1	7	3.8
Other	0	0	7	10.0	0	0	7	3.8
No Data	12	24.0	4	5.7	4	6.3	20	10.9

Table XXV-A

School History of Sample Graduates

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Age-Grade Placement (Years Above or Below)								
3 or more years below	0	0	2	2.9	1	1.6	3	1.6
2 years below	2	4.0	1	1.5	2	3.1	5	2.7
1 year below	4	8.0	12	17.1	14	21.9	30	16.3
At grade level	44	88.0	55	78.5	45	70.3	144	78.3
1 or more years above	0	0	0	0	2	3.1	2	1.1
Attendance: Graduates Were Absent More Than 8 Per Cent of Total School Days, by Number* and Per Cent**								
Grade Level								
1	24	48.0	29	41.4	30	46.9	83	45.1
2	13	26.0	26	37.1	27	42.2	66	35.9
3	8	16.0	23	32.9	15	23.4	46	25.0
4	9	18.0	18	25.7	17	26.6	44	23.9
5	4	8.0	13	18.6	15	23.4	32	17.4
6	5	10.0	16	22.9	13	20.3	34	18.5
7	6	12.0	13	18.6	12	18.8	31	16.8
8	12	24.0	23	32.9	10	15.6	45	24.5
9	14	28.0	23	32.9	16	25.0	53	28.8
10	18	36.0	29	41.4	21	32.8	68	37.0
11	24	48.0	36	51.4	26	40.6	86	46.7
12	21	42.0	37	52.9	20	31.2	78	42.4
No Data	14	28.0	21	30.0	19	29.7	54	29.3

*These numbers are non-additive. If an individual were absent more than 8 per cent of the time in three grades or were retained in three grades, all three were tallied.

**Percentages are based on total numbers of sample graduates for each school area.

Table XXV-A (cont'd)

Failures: Grade Level at Which Graduates
Were Retained, by Number* and Per Cent**

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grade Level								
1	1	2.0	6	8.6	4	6.3	11	5.9
2	-	---	-	---	2	3.1	2	1.2
3	1	2.0	1	1.4	-	---	2	1.2
4	2	4.0	2	2.8	1	1.6	5	2.7
5	1	2.0	1	1.4	-	---	2	1.2
6	-	---	-	---	1	1.6	1	.6
7	-	---	1	1.4	2	3.1	3	1.6
8	-	---	-	---	1	1.6	1	.6
9	-	---	1	1.4	-	---	1	.6
10	1	2.0	-	---	-	---	1	.6
11	-	---	-	---	-	---	-	---
12	-	---	-	---	-	---	-	---
None	43	86.0	55	78.7	47	73.4	145	78.8
No Data	1	2.0	3	4.3	6	9.3	10	5.4

Table XXV-A (cont'd)

Academic Performance, by School Level

Elementary (Grade 1-6)	Hon No	Hon %	Rural Oahu No	Rural Oahu %	Neigh Island No	Neigh Island %	State No	State %
Good or Better (Predominate A's, B's, +'s, or E's)	0	0	1	1.4	0	0	1	.6
Satisfactory* (Predominate C's, ✓'s, or S's)	33	66.0	44	62.9	38	59.4	115	62.5
Poor or Worse* (Predominate D's, F's, -'s, or U's)	9	18.0	13	18.6	17	26.5	39	21.1
No Data	8	16.0	12	17.1	9	14.1	29	15.8
Intermediate (Grade 7-9)								
Good or Better (Predominate A's, B's, +'s, or E's)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Satisfactory* (Predominate C's, ✓'s, or S's)	31	62.0	36	51.4	37	57.8	104	56.5
Poor or Worse* (Predominate D's, F's, -'s, or U's)	13	26.0	29	41.4	21	32.8	63	34.2
No Data	6	12.0	5	7.2	6	9.4	17	9.3
High School (Grade 10-12)								
Good or Better (Predominate A's, B's, +'s, or E's)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Satisfactory* (Predominate C's, ✓'s, or S's)	20	40.0	34	48.6	34	53.1	88	47.8
Poor or Worse* (Predominate D's, F's, -'s, or U's)	30	60.0	36	51.4	30	46.9	96	52.2
No Data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

---

*As long as 50 per cent or more of the total end-of-year grades were C or better, performance was rated as satisfactory.

Character Trait Ratings, by School Level

	Hon No	Hon %	Rural Oahu No	Rural Oahu %	Neigh Island No	Neigh Island %	State No	State %
Elementary (Grade 1-6)								
Above Average (Predominate 1's)	2	4.0	0	0	1	1.6	3	1.6
Average (Predominate 2's)	31	62.0	48	68.6	30	46.9	109	59.2
Below Average (Predominate 3's)	9	18.0	11	15.7	25	39.0	45	24.5
No Data	8	16.0	11	15.7	8	12.5	27	14.7
Secondary (Grade 7-12)								
Above Average (Predominate 1's)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average (Predominate 2's)	39	78.0	61	87.1	61	95.3	161	87.5
Below Average (Predominate 3's)	7	14.0	3	4.2	2	3.1	12	6.5
No Data	4	8.0	6	8.7	1	1.6	11	6.0

Table XXV-A (cont'd)

Number of Disciplinary Notations Found in Records, Secondary

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5 or more	0	0	2	2.9	1	1.6	3	1.6
3 to 4	2	4.0	2	2.9	5	7.8	9	4.9
1 to 2	2	4.0	12	17.1	9	14.0	23	12.5
None Found	46	92.0	54	77.1	49	76.6	149	81.0
No Data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Per Cent of Courses "Unsatisfactory" at Last Report

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0%	2	4.0	9	12.9	4	6.3	15	8.2
10 - 19%	5	10.0	8	11.4	4	6.3	17	9.2
20 - 29%	4	8.0	3	4.3	6	9.4	13	7.0
30 - 39%	5	10.0	10	14.3	12	18.7	27	14.7
40 - 49%	9	18.0	5	7.1	6	9.4	20	10.9
50 - 59%	9	18.0	15	21.4	11	17.2	35	19.0
60 - 69%	3	6.0	11	15.7	9	14.0	23	12.5
70 - 79%	5	10.0	3	4.3	1	1.6	9	4.9
80 - 89%	4	8.0	2	2.9	9	14.0	15	8.2
90 - 99%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100%	4	8.0	4	5.7	2	3.1	10	5.4
Median	50.0%		50.0%		50.0%		50 0%	

Table XXVI-A

Elementary School Standardized Test Scores for Graduates, by School Area

Honolulu	CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Grade 3	Other Total Test IQ Scores[a]	All Total Test IQ Scores	
	Number	Number	Number	Per Cent
70 and below	3		3	6.0
71 - 75	3		3	6.0
76 - 80	5		5	10.0
81 - 85	4		4	8.0
86 - 90	3		3	6.0
91 - 95	7	1	8	16.0
96 - 100	6	1	7	14.0
101 - 105	4		4	8.0
106 - 110	3		3	6.0
111 - 115	3	1	4	8.0
116 and above	1		1	2.0
No Data	5		5	10.0

Median (based on the 45 known cases): 94

CAT Grade Placement, Grade 4

Honolulu	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	2	4.0	2	4.0
2.1 - 2.9	15	30.0	10	20.0
3.0 - 4.1	15	30.0	16	32.0
4.2 and above	9	18.0	12	24.0
No Data	9	18.0	10	20.0

Median (based on known cases): Reading 3.5, Total 4.0

---

[a] For those records that lacked a CTMM Grade 3 IQ Score, the earliest score for an IQ test taken during elementary school was listed under this column. As it turned out, of the 48 individuals who did not have a CTMM Grade 3 IQ Score, 26 had "Other IQ Scores" and these were combined with the 126 who had the CTMM Grade 3 Score under the column "All Total Test IQ Scores."

Table XXVI-A (cont'd)

Neighbor Island	CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Grade 3	Other Total Test IQ Scores [a]	All Total Test IQ Scores	
	Number	Number	Number	Per Cent
70 and below	3	1	4	6.2
71 - 75	2	1	3	4.7
76 - 80	4	2	6	9.4
81 - 85	6	-	6	9.4
86 - 90	7	1	8	12.5
91 - 95	7	-	7	10.9
96 - 100	5	2	7	10.9
101 - 105	8	-	8	12.5
106 - 110	6	-	6	9.4
111 - 115	1	-	1	1.6
116 and above	0	-	0	0
No Data	8	-	8	12.5

Median (based on the 56 known cases): 92

CAT Grade Placement, Grade 4

Neighbor Island	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	5	7.8	3	4.7
2.1 - 2.9	20	31.3	11	17.2
3.0 - 4.1	14	21.9	20	31.2
4.2 and above	9	14.0	10	15.6
No Data	16	25.0	20	31.3

Median (based on known cases): Reading 2.9, Total 3.8

Table XXVI-A (cont'd)

Rural Oahu	CTMM Total Test IQ Scores, Grade 3	Other Total Test IQ Scores [a]	All Total Test IQ Scores	
	Number	Number	Number	Per Cent
70 and below	2	1	3	4.3
71 - 75	8	1	9	12.9
76 - 80	4	1	5	7.1
81 - 85	6	-	6	8.6
86 - 90	6	3	9	12.8
91 - 95	10	-	10	14.3
96 - 100	5	-	5	7.1
101 - 105	5	-	5	7.1
106 - 110	3	-	3	4.3
111 - 115	3	1	4	5.7
116 and above	1	-	1	1.5
No Data	10	-	10	14.3

Median (based on the 60 known cases): 90

CAT Grade Placement, Grade 4

Rural Oahu	Reading		Total (Reading, Arithmetic, Language)	
	No.	%	No.	%
2.0 and below	2	2.9	2	2.9
2.1 - 2.9	17	24.3	10	14.3
3.0 - 4.1	27	38.5	31	44.3
4.2 and above	10	14.3	11	15.7
No Data	14	20.0	16	22.8

Median (based on known cases): Reading 3.7, Total 4.0

Table XXVII-A

Family Background of Sample Graduates

Highest Grade Completed by Father

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grades 0 - 2	0	0	1	1.5	9	14.0	10	5.4
3 - 4	0	0	0	0	3	4.7	3	1.6
5 - 6	3	6.0	7	10.0	9	14.0	19	10.3
7 - 8	10	20.0	13	18.5	20	31.3	43	23.4
9 - 10	10	20.0	16	22.8	6	9.4	32	17.4
11 - 12	13	26.0	15	21.4	4	6.3	32	17.4
13 - 14	3	6.0	0	0	0	0	3	1.6
15 - 16	11	22.0	3	4.3	1	1.6	15	8.2
No Data	0	0	15	21.4	12	18.7	27	14.7
Median (Based on known cases)	11		10		8		9	

Highest Grade Completed by Mother

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grades 0 - 2	0	0	0	0	2	3.1	2	1.2
3 - 4	3	6.0	2	2.9	5	7.8	10	5.4
5 - 6	2	4.0	1	1.5	5	7.8	8	4.3
7 - 8	8	16.0	13	18.5	19	29.7	40	21.7
9 - 10	10	20.0	16	22.8	11	17.2	37	20.1
11 - 12	19	38.0	22	31.4	12	18.7	53	28.8
13 - 14	0	0	1	1.5	0	0	1	.6
15 - 16	0	0	2	2.9	1	1.6	3	1.6
No Data	8	16.0	13	18.5	9	14.0	30	16.3
Median (Based on known cases)	11		9		9		10	

Table XXVII-A (cont'd)

Number of Siblings

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1.5	0	0	1	.6
2 - 3	14	28.0	23	32.8	13	20.3	50	27.2
4 - 5	17	34.0	22	31.4	19	29.7	58	31.5
6 - 7	7	14.0	14	20.0	13	20.3	34	18.4
8 or more	4	8.0	3	4.3	11	17.2	18	9.8
No Data	8	16.0	7	10.0	8	12.5	23	12.5
Median (Based on known cases)	5		5		5		5	

Occupation of Father

	Honolulu		Rural Oahu		Neighbor Island		State Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional - Managerial	0	0	3	4.3	0	0	3	1.6
Professional - Technical	2	4.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.2
Skilled	16	32.0	24	34.3	11	17.2	51	27.6
Clerical	1	2.0	5	7.1	1	1.6	7	3.8
Semi-skilled	9	18.0	19	27.1	18	28.1	46	25.0
Service	8	16.0	4	5.7	5	7.8	17	9.2
Sales	1	2.0	3	4.3	1	1.6	5	2.7
Farmers	0	0	1	1.5	7	10.9	8	4.3
Unskilled	4	8.0	4	5.7	14	21.9	22	12.0
Unemployed	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	1	.6
No Data	9	18.0	7	10.0	6	9.4	22	12.0

APPENDIX D

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS IN THE FIVE PARTICIPATING HIGH SCHOOLS

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS IN THE FIVE PARTICIPATING HIGH SCHOOLS*

Aiea High School

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Project, "Decreasing School Alienation." Purposes: (1) To change in a positive direction attitudes toward school and education, (2) To improve students' daily attendance, and (3) To provide financial stipends as an immediate reward for attendance. Selected students attend a special business-industry and world of work program that will interest and retain them in school. Students plan, design, and manufacture feasible products for sale. Profits from sale of products will be shared among students. Students are paid a stipend for regular attendance in school with "raises" each quarter as attendance improves.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I and Higher Education Act Project, "Cooperative Counseling--Educational Guidance and Opportunities." Purposes: (1) To raise the occupational and/or educational aspirational level of children coming from low-income areas, and (2) To improve the emotional and social stability of children from low-income area. Full-time counselor provided to identify disadvantaged youth of exceptional financial need with coordinated vocational and educational planning to work with them and their parents to motivate and enable students to fully utilize opportunities available.

Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program, a program of work, study, and counseling for disadvantaged youth. Financial support for needy youth.

Farrington High School

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Project, "Decreasing School Alienation." The project is geared towards motivating the educationally disadvantaged students to relate more favorably to their school environment with the following purposes: (1) To improve academic performance and (2) To change positively the children's attitude toward school and education. The project provides for remedial reading resources, experience enrichment program of field trips, excursions, camps, and conferences, extended school day program of enrichment and remedial curricular activities, activities enrichment program such as student government projects, club work, and social and service functions, and expanded extramural athletics.

Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program, a program of work, study, and counseling for disadvantaged youth. Financial support for needy youth.

National Teacher Corps laboratory school for teacher trainees. Identified potential dropouts are placed in small groups for intensified instruction and guidance with Teacher Corps trainees.

Special Motivation Class--one class developed for potential dropouts.

Source: Office of Instructional Services, Special Services Branch, Hawaii DOE

Kailua High School

Flexible Scheduling Project designed to take care of individual differences in which educational programs are tailored to fit individual needs and abilities.

Kaimuki High School

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Project, "Intensified Counseling Program." Three full-time counselors provide intensified counseling services for approximately 195 educationally deprived students who are the worst attendance cases in school. Approaches and activities used are: (1) Intensified individual counseling, (2) Intensified group counseling, (3) Systematic exclusion, (4) Case conferences, (5) Home visitation, (6) Psychological consultation, (7) Individual and group tutoring, and (8) Program changes.

Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program.

Special Motivation Class - two classes.

Waianae High School

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Project, "Counseling Services for N. Y. C. Students." Identification and intensified full-time counseling services for students participating in the N. Y. C. program.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Project, "Language Arts and Social Studies Improvement Project." With additional classroom assistance, teachers are provided more time to devote to instruction and guidance of students who come from educational deprived families and are in the lowest sections of the grade level. There is small group instruction and individualized instruction utilizing slow learner guides written by teachers.

Special Motivation Class - two classes.

Cooperative Work Experience Program with the dairy industry and service stations.

Cooperative Counseling - Educational Guidance and Opportunities.

APPENDIX E

SELECTED STUDIES REPORTING SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO PREVENT SCHOOL WITHDRAWAL

APPENDIX D

TABLE 26.--SELECTED STUDIES REPORTING SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO PREVENT SCHOOL WITHDRAWAL *

Study and year 1	Location 2	Purpose 3	Subjects 4	Controls 5	Description of program 6	Results 7	Remarks 8
Flynn, Saunders, and Hoppock, 1954	Huntington, N.Y. Toaz Junior High School	1. Prepare potential dropouts for work 2. Encourage some to remain in school by relating school to work 3. Fulfill social studies requirement	22 male potential dropouts, ninth grade, 15-18 years old	None	Class met 1 hour a day for 2 semesters content. Cooperatively planned, and included discussion of job requirements and application techniques, and field trips to industries.	20 of 22 subjects returned to school at beginning of 10th grade. According to principal, fewer absences and discipline problems.	...
Young, 1966 (146)	Dade County, Florida--4 junior high schools	Appraise relative effectiveness of 4 curricula from standpoint of retention, attendance, attitudes, conduct, and achievement	9th grade male potential dropouts who would reach age 16 before end of study; divided into 4 groups	9th grade male potential dropouts in regular school program matched with each experimental group	Four groups for subjects--3 followed a basic junior high-school program with variations 1. Emphasis upon reading 2. Work-study combination 3. Guidance orientation Group 4. Dropouts who had returned to school in the adult division.	The 3 basic experimental groups were slightly, but not significantly, superior to respective control groups. The work-study group was superior to the reading and guidance groups, which were fairly equal. 3 basic experimental groups combined were significantly superior ($p<.003$) to the overall control group.	...
Chamberlin and Catterall	El Cajon, Calif. Greenfield Junior High School	Prevent dropping out through acceleration at the 7th grade level	34 (21 male, 13 female) average none 7th graders--average IQ 96, lower tested achievement than other 7th graders	None	Placed for 1 semester in special class designed to cover 7th and 8th grade material at same time Pretested on Metropolitan Achievement Test, post-tested on different form.	Median scores of subjects improved on all 10 subtests of MAT. Median growth in years ranged from 2.1 years in history to .4 years in Geography and Science. On all subtests median growth in years was at or above expected (normal) growth. Follow-up 2-1/2 years later--20 located, 18 still in school--3 rated by counselors as poorly adjusted, 15 satisfactory or better.	During session group lost 9 subjects: 2 moved, 2 could not do the work, and 5 were asked to leave because they would not work and/or behave.
Camp, 1963	Elgin, Illinois High School	Bring about favorable changes in concepts of self, achievement, and future	18 males randomly selected from list of those having failed 1 or more courses during previous semester and identified by counselor as potential dropouts. Age range, 14-17. Measured IQ range, 76-120	18 males randomly selected from remaining list, matched on chronological age and IQ	Subjects assigned to class taught by teacher counselor, controls assigned to elective class. Experimental class content unstructured and chosen by subjects, ranged from discussion of values to inspection of vocational information. Grade assigned by subject and teacher. Pre- and post-semester, semi-structured interviews with counselor, who recorded answers to open-ended questions.	Positive changes in subjects greater at or beyond .05 level than controls on: Pride in self and achievement Self-understanding, self-confidence Vocational information Value of formal education and high-school diploma Liked content and structure of courses Class activities evaluation Discussion of future with parents Discipline Subjects absent average of 1.5 days per pupil less than preceding semester and 0.65 days per pupil less than controls during experiment semester.	...
Davis, 1962		1. Keep potential dropouts in school longer 2. Raise achievement rate 3. Improve realism of concepts of self	21 graduating 9th graders. Group of 42 originally judged to be most likely to drop out during 10th grade stratified and grouped into 3 groups	21 remaining from group of 42 judged most likely to drop-out during 10th grade	During 10th grade, experimental group given special attention by way of field trips, formal and informal counseling interviews. Teachers and counselors made special effort to establish friendship relations.	Purpose: 1. No subjects, 3 controls dropped out during 10th grade. 2. Both groups' average scores on reading dropped and average scores on mathematics rose--no significant differences between groups.	Calif. Achievement Battery

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		4. Decrease course failures 5. Decrease discipline problems	according to intelligence. These 3 groups divided into subjects and controls			3. No difference between groups on realism of self-concept of aptitudes, as judged by self-estimate of Differential Aptitude test scores. 4. Subjects had 19 failing marks, controls, 44. 5. Subjects had less severe discipline problems. Amount of intelligence not a factor except in marks--those of higher intelligence tended to get higher marks..	
Wilkerson	St. Louis, Mo. high school	Increase school retention of potential dropouts	343 potential high-school dropouts. Approximate mean age, 17; mean IQ, 94; mean number of credits earned, 11	266 potential high-school dropouts roughly matched on age, IQ, and number of credits earned	Work-study program: during 1960-61, and 1961-62 school years, experimental subjects received normal school services plus special counseling, help in obtaining and holding jobs, and special on-the-job assistance from employer and school personnel Control group received normal school services.	Dropout rate for controls greater than subjects, by 5.7 percent for first year, and by 4.4 percent for second year--17.9 percent for two-year period.	...
School Management	Ithaca, N.Y.	Enable potential dropouts to earn money while going to school	50 potential dropouts who had taken basic course in retailing--screened and chosen on basis of probable success	None	Work-study program--distributive education. Students take regular courses toward high-school diploma and work 600 hours during school year for 1 hour of credit; students matched with employer, who must supervise and teach in field of retailing.	Of 50 participants in 2-year period, none have dropped out of school. Authors say "most have marketable ability in area of retailing."	...
Bienenstock and Sayres, 1964	N.Y. State, 10 cities	Provide potential dropouts with educational and work experience that will enable them to succeed in full-time employment if they drop out, or motivate them to return to regular school program	793 identified by school as potential dropouts--15 years old or older	None	Subjects must want to take part in program, must have good prognosis for rehabilitation, and must have parental consent. Spend 2-4 periods per day in regular classes, 1 in class on general work orientation, and 3-4 periods in work.	During 1-year period, 44% completed the year in the program, 27% returned to normal school because of satisfactory progress, 11% began full-time employment, 13% removed from program because of unsatisfactory progress, and 5% dropped out of school. The percentage of dropouts was slightly lower in New York City, but the percentage of those either completing the program or returning to regular school was slightly higher in upstate districts (75.5%) than in New York City (69.3%).	...
Bienenstock		Follow-up study of 1961-62 STEP participants and controls--1 year after completion of program	175 potential dropouts 15 years and older	165 with "similar characteristics" in regular school programs	Information from records and employers.	Greater percentage of subjects (37%) than controls (22%) in regular school program and doing satisfactory work or in full-time employment (21% and 9%). No information on 24% of subjects and 40% of controls.	...

---

*National Education Association Research Division, School Dropouts (Washington, 1967), pp. 44-45